$1.50 per Annum.

VOLUME III. NOVEMBER, 1885.

Shakespeariana

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

THE LATEST

— BY —

F. MARION CRAWFORD.

SARRACINESCA

— IN —

BLACKWOOD'S

Edinburgh Magazine.

Price 30c. per number.

Registered as Second Class Matter.

1 268572 7.32

SHAKESPEARIANA.

NO. XXXV. NOVEMBER, 1886. VOL. III.

CONTENTS:

The Sisters of Portia. E. CAVAZZA. 495

Shylock. JONATHAN TRUMBULL. 501

The Editors of Shakespeare. J. PARKER NORRIS. 510

XIII. Ambrose Eccles.

XIV. Isaac Reed.

A SCHOOL OF SHAKESPEARE. 515

Outline of a Scheme for a Course of Shakespeare Study:—*The Merchant of Venice.* Prof. Wm. Taylor Thom. 516

Antonio, the Merchant. C. P. 518

SHAKESPEARE SOCIETIES.

The Montreal Shakespeare Club. 520

A San Francisco Shakespeare Class. 522

THE DRAMA

Mr. Lawrence Barrett's Shylock. 523

Hamlet on the French Stage. 526

LITERARY NOTES. 529

Shakespeariana in Current Magazines and Papers. 534

MISCELLANY.

Restoration of the Hart Tablet. 537

SELECTED REPRINTS.

Part II.—Prolegomena to the Folio of 1623. [*Concluded.*] . . 541

Contributions on subjects within the scope of the magazine are desired, and will receive prompt attention and reply.

As SHAKESPEARIANA holds a peculiar place among periodicals, by reason of its unique design and special field, its greatest possible measure of usefulness and success can not be reached without the co-operation of all students and lovers of Shakespeare and Shakespearian literature. It asks therefore, that the members of Shakespeare Societies and Classes everywhere, will report their work and condition from time to time, and also any bits of Shakespearian news of interest, indulgently leaving their publication, of course, to the judgment of the Editor, in view of the needs, opportunities and conveniences of the magazine. Address,

EDITOR OF SHAKESPEARIANA,
1104 Walnut St., Phila

PHILADELPHIA:
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY,
1104 WALNUT STREET.

THE

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO'S.

PERIODICALS.

Single Copies for sale by the following Dealers in Cities named.

BALTIMORE, MD.,	BALTIMORE NEWS CO.,	Sun. Iron Building.
BOSTON, MASS.,	CUPPLES, UPHAM & CO.,	283 Washington St.
CHICAGO, ILL.,	BRENTANO BROS.,	101 State St.
CINCINNATI, OHIO.	ROBERT CLARKE & CO.,	61 West 4th, St.
HALIFAX, NOVA SCO.,	T. C. ALLEN & CO.,	124 Granville St.
HAMILTON, CANADA.	J. EASTWOOD & CO.,	
MONTREAL, CANADA.	DAWSON BROS.,	233 St. James St.
NEW ORLEANS, LA.,	GEO. F. WHARTON & BRO.,	5 Carondelet St.
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.,	BRENTANO BROS.,	5 Union Square.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.,	LEONARD SCOTT PUB. CO.,	1104 Walnut St.
PROVIDENCE, R. I.,	S. S. RIDER.	
RICHMOND, VA.,	BECKWITH & PARHAM.	
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.,	J. C. SCOTT.	22 Third St.
ST. JOHN, N. B.,	A. & J. MCMILLAN.	98 Prince William St.
ST. LOUIS, MO.,	ST. LOUIS NEWS CO.,	
TORONTO, CANADA.	HART & CO.,	31 King St., W.
VICTORIA, BR. COL.,	T. H. HIBBEN & CO.,	Masonic Building.
WASHINGTON, D. C.,	BRENTANO BROS.,	1015 Penna. Av.

Annual Subscriptions Received by all Booksellers and Newsdealers.

THE LEONARD SCOTT PUB. CO.

1104 WALNUT STREET,

PHILADELPHIA, PA

NOTE.

At the request of the editor of SHAKESPEARIANA, I have decided to transfer the Membership of my *Course of Shakespeare Historical Reading* to that Journal, and to publish in its monthly numbers every thing that I had proposed to send to the Members of my Course in the shape of circulars. It gives me pleasure to make this announcement to my actual and prospective subscribers, since they will now be enabled to get for $1.50, (the annual subscription to SHAKESPEARIANA), what would have otherwise cost $5.00; and since they will get in addition all the valuable articles, and reprints to be found in SHAKESPEARIANA, as well as the benefit of all the contributions to the *School of Shakespeare* made by others as well as by myself.

Persons thinking of joining my Course, can send in their subscriptions, ($1.50); and addresses in full to SHAKESPEARIANA, 1104 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, or to me, and the magazine will be sent them beginning with the October number.

Respectfully,

Hollin's Institute,
Hollin's P. O., Va.

WM. TAYLOR THOM.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/n35shakespearian03shakuoft

THE SISTERS OF PORTIA.

PORTIA: You see me, Lord Bassanio, where I stand,
Such as I am. *Merchant of Venice*, III, ii, 149.

If we of the present time, so far removed by centuries and by customs, would see Portia such as she was—it will be necessary to study her as a type of the *grande dame* of the Italian Renaissance. It will not be possible to assign a definite epoch to her existence; for, while the most striking episode of the play of the *Merchant of Venice* dates back to a story told in the fourteenth century, and consequently the especial direction of Portia's intellect conforms to the fashion of learning of that period, her personality and surroundings are distinctly of the *cinque-cento*, at the close of which time Shakespeare wrote his drama. So perhaps we may, in order to form a vivid vision of the personality of Portia, justly consider her as a concentration of the feminine ideal of the Renaissance, a period of most brilliant and important transitions in the history of woman in Italy.

Let us observe a little the influences which went to the formation of this type:

In the days of the troubadours, women were little more than slaves, notwithstanding the perfunctory and false adulation offered them at Tourneys and Courts of Love. In the stormy and distracted period preceding the Renaissance, Italy was torn by innumerable struggles; and the state of society was such that women whose husbands or fathers were gone to the wars, were compelled to take refuge in the convents, where they prayed for peace and awaited news of their warriors. In the cold seclusion and enforced leisure of the cloisters was sown the seed of the love of learning and of poetry which, in the following centuries, was to distingush the Italian women. With intellectual development came a consciousness of power, and this was not slow or uncertain in its affirmation.

Among the poetesses of the *trecento*—for the most a gentle train of lyric nymphs who imitated the sonnets and songs of Petrarch—appears clearly defined the figure of Leonora della Genga, like an Amazon among Arcadian shepherdesses. Since she was the first literary exponent in Italy of the theory of the rights of women, and had no indifferent part in preparing the way for the possibility of a Portia,

it may not be irrelevant to offer here a translation into English verse of the famous sonnet of Leonora della Genga—premising that in the change of idiom it loses somewhat of its original vigor:—

Give over, men, to say and to declare
That Nature nothing but the man intends,
And that to form the feminine she lends,
Except against her will, but little care.
What envy takes your mind, what cloud is there
That your intelligence not comprehends
How all her strength on woman she expends
And gives to you of glory a lesser share?
To wield the sword do women know right well,
To govern empires; yea, and furthermore,
They know the road that leads to Helicon.
In everything you are inconsiderable,
Ye men, compared to them. No man hath power
To take from woman's hand her fame or crown.

This sonnet, although not precisely conciliating, could not fail to be effective with the minds of men; and Boccaccio refers to it in his treatise De Claris Mulieribus. And thus, under the auspices of Messer Boccaccio—who cites as examples a host of women, famous or infamous, as the case might be, in the annals of antiquity—the intellect and place of woman began to be recognized in Italy.

The extent of the knowledge of that epoch was very limited, compared with that of our own century. It was not then, as it now is, an immense ocean of which the horizon continually recedes before our progress; but seemed rather like an inland sea, readily navigable from shore to shore. And like the early mariners at their oars, the Italian scholars of the *trecento* sat facing backward, with their gaze immoveably fixed upon the past. It was a patriotic instinct which led them to look fondly at the former glories of Italy—only a few elect spirits such as Dante were able to foresee the glories of the possible future.

At the great universities of Bologna, Padua and other cities the principal studies were Law, Theology and Philosophy—the latter branch including also Medicine. To these were later added "the humanities," Greek and Latin literature; which, at first subordinate, greatly increased in importance during the next two hundred years, until classicism pervaded the whole thought and literature of Italy. Learning was universally pursued with a passionate ardor of which the final aim was to secure for oneself a lasting name, and praise that should remain perdurable beyond the limits of mortal life. Dante has expressed this desire in the fourth canto of the *Inferno*, where the word honor in its various forms—*orrevol*, *onori*, *orranza*, *onrata*, *onorate*—sounds and resounds as when "the note of a trumpet is heard from the right hand, and from the left another answers."

In those days, the education of girls was identical with that of their brothers. The ideal of the woman of the Renaissance was that she

should be in every way the companion and equal of man; and that to the learned reunions, fashionable at the courts of princes and nobles, she should be able to contribute the treasures of her intellect as well as the grace of her presence. The learned Gregorovius in his monograph upon Lucrezia Borgia, has noted that the idea that mental cultivation is injurious to womanly charm, is a prejudice entirely of Germanic origin, and one which never occurred to the Italians of the Renaissance. He points with pride to the many distinguished figures of potent and noble women that appear in the history of Italy during the Renaissance, and, at a period somewhat later in the history of a kindred Latin nation, France; while in Germany and in England, at the same epoch, feminine influence played no prominent part.

Hence we find the way prepared for extraordinary displays of learning among the Italian women; and the actions of Shakespeare's Portia will no longer appear to us unusual, unfeminine, or capricious, nor even as the improbable invention of the dramatist, or the writer of *novelle*.

The episode of the discomfiture of the money-lender has been traced back to the *Gesta Romanorum;* but in the elder version it differs upon an important point from the story as given in *Il Pecorone* of Ser Giovanni Fiorentino, and in various other *novelle* of the fourteenth century—it lacks the beautiful personality of the lady disguised as a lawyer. But in telling his story to an audience of the *trecento*, Ser Giovanni could point to a group of women, some of them still living at the time, who would have been quite capable of the action of his heroine.

At the University of Bologna there flourished a company of ladies learned in the law, whose duty and opportunities as daughters and wives led them first to study, then to teach, jurisprudence.

One of these was Bitisia Gozzadini, who was crowned laureate of law by the unanimous vote of the Padri Togati, in the presence of the applauding nobles and people of Bologna.

Novella and Bettina Andrea were the daughters of Giovanni Andrea, a jurist eminent in Canon Law. These sisters were deeply versed in philosophy and in the classics, as well as in legal studies; and upon the occasions of the absence of her father, madonna Novella assumed the chair of the professor and taught his classes—having first taken the precaution to veil her beautiful face in order that the minds of the students should not be diverted from Canon Law to that of Cupid. Novella Andrea, after her marriage to the learned jurist Giovanni Oldrenghi, frequently acted as the colleague of her husband, prepared briefs, and lectured to his classes. Cristofano Bronzini of Ancona wrote of her:

> Novella, of Bologna, was so highly versed in the laws that she read publicly at Padua, and she, being very learned, whenever her father or her husband was occupied in public or private business, took worthily the chair, and continued the

lessons begun by her husband or her father, to the infinite use and satisfation of all the hearers.

It is pleasant to know that Oldrenghi appreciated the worth of his lovely and learned wife; and that when Pope Urban V. offered him the robe of a cardinal, with the condition that he should induce his wife to leave him and become a nun, he promptly refused, and taught the world, says the chronicle, that virtue is above purple and fine linen.

The other sister, Bettina Andrea, married Giovanni Sangiorgi, doctor of laws at Padua, and was able to assist him in his lessons of jurisdiction and philosophy, although her fame as an expounder of law remained inferior to that of Novella.

Among many other instances may be cited that of Maddalena Buonsignori, who took a degree and then taught jurisprudence at the University of Bologna, where Brunetto Latini and Guido Guinicelli taught, and Dante Alighieri was a pupil. The historian Magliani says that the *dottoressa* Maddalena wrote a treatise De Legibus Connubialibus, in which she combined profound knowledge of ancient laws with original and acute interpretation.

A generous oratress, of a spirit akin to that of Portia, was Galeana Savioli, who defended the cause of her husband, the senator Brancaleone, before the public council of Bologna. She refuted the false accusations which had been brought against him at Rome; and to such effect, that she saved him from threatened death and caused his restoration to his former dignities.

The stories written by Ser Giovanni in the year 1378, bore the collective title of *Il Pecorone* (The Simpleton). These tales are supposed to be related in turn by a prioress and her chaplain, who, sitting in the convent parlor, tell the legends, founded upon facts of history, concerning the builders of Troy, Frederic Barbarossa, the Countess Matilda, the Guelfs and Ghibellines, and others, less imposing in their themes, such as the first *novella* of the fourth day, from which Shakespeare took the plot of *The Merchant of Venice*. Ser Giovanni was so good as to explain in a sonnet his reasons for naming his book *Il Pecorone*, and modestly observes, that of the company of simpletons he himself is chief.

Between the date of the writing of these tales and their publication at Milan in 1558, with a subsequent English translation, there occurred in Italy many brilliant examples of feminine learning and eloquence. Among these was Tarquinia Molza, born at Modena in 1522, and granddaughter of the poet of the same name. She learned Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, was familiar with the classic authors, and studied philosophy, mathematics and astronomy, without neglecting the fine arts. She was also lady in waiting to the Princess Lucrezia and Leonora d'Este, and Tasso wrote one of his dialogues in her honor. In the year 1600, the Roman senate and people rewarded her with a diploma for her eminence in the sciences, classics and poetry, as well as for her courage

and virtue. They gave her the freedom of the city of Rome, and for her sake, extended it also to the entire Molza family of Modena and to their descendants.

Cassandra Fedele, borne at Venice about the year 1465, was learned in classic literature, philosophy, oratory, history, theology and music. She enchanted by her eloquence the magistrates of the Venetian republic, and her profound knowledge of philosophy, Greek, and Latin astonished the severe doctors of the University of Padua. She corresponded with kings, prelates and men of letters; and was as eminent, says the biographer Comba, for virtue and social graces as for erudition.

This is the very type of Portia; and may even have been the model from which Shakespeare drew this superb portrait of a Venetian lady —a portrait which Titian might have painted with the palette in place of the vocabulary. Indeed, were Portia the historical woman, and Cassandra Fedele the creation of the dramatist, only then might the reader have been tempted to charge Shakespeare with exaggeration of the perfections of his heroine. At least, it will be easy to believe that Portia's legal knowledge was so profund and her wit so trained and ready, that she required but little aid from her cousin, who was probably also her former teacher, Doctor Bellario of Padua. All that was necessary, was the letter to the Prince, which must come from Bellario and in his own handwriting, and the loan of the costumes of the doctor and of the clerk. And if the ingenious plan of the defence were the result of her own legal knowledge, and not supplied (as without these precedents of feminine jurisprudence we should have been left to believe) by doctor Bellario, it is all the more natural that Portia, should desire to appear in person to conduct the defence which she had devised. The alleged illness of Bellario was, of course, a convenient indisposition by request of his charming cousin, and there is no doubt that he could and would have come to Venice had he feared that Portia could not prove equal to the emergency.

To return to the history of the Renaissance, here very slightly and rapidly sketched only as a background for the figure of Shakespeare's Portia, we find that in Italy of the sixteenth century, woman was at the highest point of her glory. Men of letters, poets and statesmen vied in the celebration of the apotheosis of woman—as Magliani calls it; and it is precisely in this golden age of social and literary history that we may fancy Portia in the enjoyment of a heritage of feminine prestige which as we have seen, had been gradually amassing for her endowment since the time of the emphatic Leonora della Genga. If one might choose the point of time in which to imagine the Lady of Belmont in all the splendor of her beauty and riches, and surrounded by the nobly intellectual personages of the play of *The Merchant of Venice*,—the early years of the sixteenth century would seem an appropriate time. The Italian Renaissance had ripened to its perfection; and this rich fruit of the tree of knowl-

edge has not yet been touched with decay. Venice was living in a dream of Oriental magnificence; its commerce and art were hand in hand; and the wealth of the nations went and came through the arterial system of its water-ways. Yet a few more years, and the power of Venice was to decline. It is not easy to imagine Portia among the premonitory shadows of contest and defeat that saddened the Venetians in the later years of the century. She was the joyous daughter of a fortunate time.

Although it is not possible to insist upon points of chronology as indicated by Shakespeare, two dates appear to suggest the early years of the *cinquecento*. Antonio had sent ventures to Mexico; and the closing of the University of Padua, which event occurred in 1509, had not yet disturbed doctor Bellario in his professor's chair, and sent him with his brother instructors, to find a place in some other school.

Comment and admiration have not been lacking in regard to the perfection of detail with which Shakespeare finished his portrait of Portia. Her brilliant buoyancy, her trained intellect, her exquisite and noble *gentilezza* of a *grande dame* of the Renaissance are everywhere apparent. Her stately reserve with the unsuccessful suitors, her magnificent surrender to Bassanio are thoroughly in character, even to the touches of modest depreciation of herself in the lines

> An unlessoned girl, unschooled, unpracticed, etc.
>
> (III, ii, 159-165.)

And

> This comes too near the praising of myself.
>
> (III, iv, 22.

which notes a trait of elegant Italian manners, to this present day made a part of the refined training of children in Northern Italy.

The name, even, of Portia was happily chosen because in perfect accordance with the fashion of the *cinquecento*. Classicism reigned everywhere, even in the baptismal register; and the names of the saints were neglected in order to give the newly born daughters of noble houses such names as Porzia, Lucrezia, Atalanta, Pentesilea.

Is it perhaps too much to hope that this slight sketch of the intellectual conditions of the Italian women of the Renaissance; this array of the pallid recalled figures of the sisterhood of the Law may have somewhat availed to make Portia appear more possible and real, and to lead her into the large circle of light in which stand the shapes of actual unforgotten women who once lived in Italy, so that the erudite dames of Bologna, and the golden-haired beauties that Titian painted, and Dante's Beatrice, and madonna Laura, and Simonetta so sweetly praised, and all the lovely ladies that sing and dance and weave garlands through the centuries of Italian poetry and art shall take Portia by the hand and call her sister.

E. Cavazza.

SHYLOCK.

It was once my fortune to share a seat in a crowded railway carriage with a Jew—"an Ebrew Jew." A situation of this kind is one which usually elicits expressions of condolence from one's fellow-Christians, but such expressions would have been wasted in this case, although my fellow-traveller became at once communicative to an extent finally bordering on the confidential. He was from Bohemia—not that sea-girt land which existed in Shakepeare's fancy as the home of Florizel and Perdita—but the real, modern, geographical Bohemia. Landing in New York, a penniless youth, he was at once welcomed, sheltered and supported by people of his tribe, after the traditional manner of the Israelites. Supplied with a peddler's pack, he took up the burden of life, until by patient thrift and industry he had acquired a moderate competence, and established himself permanently in a thriving New England town. And here his troubles began. Desirous of rising to the dignity of a landholder and of enjoying the pleasure of proprietorship in a home for himself and family, he found himself the victim of a species of Christian boycott, so far as the purchase of real estate was concerned, till at last, by means of pardonable craft, he succeeded in purchasing a homestead to his mind. As it happened, his next-door neighbor was a Baptist deacon, in the same line of trade as himself, and until the advent of his Jewish rival, almost a monopolist in that line. At this point in his narrative my fellow-traveller waxed eloquent as he described the petty annoyances, slights and wrongs which he suffered at the hands of his neighbor, a detailed narrative of which would go far toward marking the quaint irony of the old New England saying, "all deacons are good men, but there's a difference in deacons." All these wrongs the Jew bore "with a patient shrug," till at last a wrong more flagrant than the rest brought matters to a point where forbearance ceased to be a virtue. Unable to contain his righteous indignation, the Jew confronted the Christian in his place of business, his Rialto, in fact, and openly accused him of dishonorable and unrighteous dealings, using as a peroration of his philippic, words substantially as follows: "If I am a Jew, I have eyes, mouth and nose like any other human being; I live by eating and drinking,

and I have human faculties and feelings which show me when I am wronged."

How deftly Shakespeare struck the keynote of the Jewish race smarting under Christian contumely and oppression, in the almost identical words of Shylock maddened by his wrongs! It is not too much to suppose that these very words were caught up by the Jews of three centuries ago and handed down from generation to generation almost as a part of their religion.

There was much food for reflection in the story of my fellow-traveller. Jewish frugality and thrift had made his life-struggle with poverty successful; through pride of race he had risen superior in the conflict with Christian oppression. Here was, in some sense, a Shylock, but where was Antonio? Do we find him in the Baptist deacon with his petty, sanctimonious hostility? Since the days of Shylock the adamantine character of the Jew has only been hardening if that were possible, while we Christians think we have vastly improved in our attitude toward the Jews. But is the outspoken enmity of Antonio, are even the brutal taunts of Salarino and Solario improved upon in any degree by the sanctimonious duplicity of the deacon or the refinement of the boycott? It is just this prejudice of old that keeps us from catching a true appreciation of the character of Shylock from the many living types about us. We see him hedged in on one side by the unchanging manners, customs, and traditions of his race and religion, and we proceed at once to hedge him in on the other side by our own opposition and prejudice, until his path in life is narrow indeed. The Jew is almost the same pariah in the Christian social world to-day as three centuries ago. The theatre-goer, or casual reader of Shakespeare imbibes at once a prejudice against Shylock from the simple fact that he is a Jew; and his name has really taken its place among the parts of speech in our language as a synonym for sordid baseness, cruelty and avarice. His dramatic position as well as his race and religion unfortunately adds to this feeling, for the whole strength of the character, grand as in many senses it is, stands as a constantly opposing force to all that we call beautiful in the play. We lose sight of the man and see only the Jew. But as in all of Shakespeare's characters, it is with the man himself, be he Jew, Turk, or infidel, that we have to do.

It is, perhaps, a truism to say that comedy is only tragedy averted or suppressed. The comedy of *The Merchant of Venice* is one in which the tragic element holds stronger sway and approaches nearer its culmination than in any other of Shakespeare's comedies. In *Twelfth Night*, for instance, the tragic is continually suppressed until it is a mere undertone, while even in *Measure for Measure* we feel a confidence that the agent for its suppression is always within reach. But in *The Merchant of Venice* this element grows and grows, until we are upon the brink of a tragedy with no visible relief at hand.

And this effect is solely due to the character of Shylock, terribly in earnest at every point, making it really a dramatic necessity that he should possess all the strength and force of will, all the intellectual power, and all the pride, hate, and avarice which his words imply. In the ever-recurring changes of potent influences which are continually working upon this strong nature, we are always in danger of losing sight of the character itself. It is perhaps no wonder that for this reason, and from the prejudices just referred to, the character often has been, and still often is, misappreciated or misunderstood. Yet through, and in spite of all these influences, the man Shylock is plainly to be seen, swayed though he is by hate, avarice and personal wrongs, yet guided by force of will, and by a keen, subtle, Jewish intellect.

In the transaction with Antonio and Bassanio he appears to be speaking with a double purpose—outwardly to assert his dignity, pride, and sense of the wrongs heaped upon him, inwardly to con his own advantages and possible means of revenge, however remote. But there is more than revenge implied in the result of the transaction; there is positive mercantile advantage. An enemy who has "hindered" him "half a million" is silenced by the coals of fire apparently heaped on his head; no longer can the voice and influence of Antonio work to the detriment of the trade plied by Shylock in the Rialto. Antonio is convinced that in signing the bond he has signed a treaty of peace; Shylock is invited to supper as a token of good will, and goes, hypocritically and reluctantly enough, after having spurned Bassanio's invitation to dinner before this ostensible treaty was concluded. Whether this advantage was a prime motive or not, he has certainly gained it, and it is hardly reasonable to suppose that the wily, astute Jew could have been unmindful of it in his eagerness to gain the other advantage of placing his enemy in his power, and establishing a remotely possible means of revenge. The results of this diplomacy are brought about with the consummate skill which not only a keen but a great intellect can command. A low usurer would have contented himself with a sharp bargain for the highest possible rate of interest on the best possible security, but Shylock takes "no doit of usance," foregoing the present advantage in the expectation of far greater advantage in the future. It is not necessary to go beyond this scene to catch the shrewd, subtle play of intellect, concentrated as it is in the apparently off-hand words

> I say
> To buy his favor I extend this friendship;
> If he will take it, so; if not, adieu;
> And, for my love, I pray you wrong me not.
>
> —I, iii, 169.

It is this very intellectual power, perhaps as much as pride of race,

or pride of purse, which gives to him the commanding presence we must accord. Through this entire scene there is a current of dignity and of independence amounting almost to hardihood when we remember, that, in spite of his fiercely muttered hate, he is held in check by the civility and servility of the money-lender to his customer, the Jew to the Christian. Something of independence may have been accorded to him from the fact that he appears to have been one of the Rothschilds of his day. Three thousand ducats in the days of Shakespeare was "a good round sum," and to the banker of to-day should mean not less than twenty-five thousand dollars. A Jewish banker who could hazard a sum like this naturally must have felt the power of his wealth, not only for his own honor, but, through him, for the honor of his race. And this pride is a strongly marked and clearly expressed feature—a pride in the very fact that he is in position at a moment's notice to lend this sum, and has the power, too, to lend it on a Christian's "single bond," without security or interest.

I think it will always be found that we make a full acquaintance with Shakespeare's old men on their first appearance if at all. It is so with *King Lear*, and it is so with Shylock, the leading instances. In the few pages of Scene Third, Act First, Shylock, in all his characteristics is plainly revealed, and his motives are plainly marked. Such characteristics under the influence of such motives, may readily lead to tragical results, should occasion offer. We know that the words he has muttered in our hearing only,

> If I can catch him once upon the hip,
> I will feed fat the ancient grudge I bear him.
>
> —I, iii, 47

still have a terrible significance for Antonio, though he knows it not.

There is one tie besides money which still binds Shylock to life, one human staff on which he still can lean—an only daughter, whom he can trust with the keeping of his ducats and his jewels, even to the ring which, above all his other treasures, he prizes as the gift of his dead wife in the far back days of his bachelor youth. Jessica alone is left him. Watchfully solicitous for her good conduct, confident of her integrity, he looks upon her as the support and comfort of his age, while he rears her in seclusion after the straightest sect of the Israelites. But we see no parental tenderness on the one hand, no filial love on the other. She sees Christian revelry and social life at a distance, and longs for its pleasures with all the longing of restrained youth. Even the jesting Launcelot is about to leave her, and to him she confesses—

> Our house is hell, and thou, a merry devil,
> Didst rob it of some taste of tediousness.
>
> —II, iii, 215.

Naturally enough, she falls in love with one of the gilded youth of

Venice, a Christian, and requires but little persuasion to fly with him from her father's house, and make him still more gilded with her father's ducats.

At this point the career of Shylock becomes a tragedy within an impending tragedy. Hitherto his wrongs have been such as he has outwardly borne "with a patient shrug," but now these wrongs are but trifles to the calamity that has befallen him. The trusted daughter is a thief, has renounced her religion and her tribe, and has fled to be married to a Christian; even the precious ring, that sacred keepsake, is among the robber's spoils. To the Jewish mind these things make up the sum of all that can carry grief, shame, and a sense of outraged pride to the parental heart, and when he exclaims,

> I would my daughter were dead at my foot and the jewels in her ear! would she were hearsed at my foot, and the ducats in her coffin,
>
> —III, i, 92.

it is as much parental grief as mourning over his losses that is manifested in his ravings. The curse has fallen upon his nation; there are no sighs but of his breathing; no tears but of his shedding. Antonio and his friends are at once uppermost in his mind as the agents and abettors of this crowning wrong of all. And just at this moment, so portentous of revenge, comes the rumor of Antonio's ruin, the possibility of the forfeiture of the bond. The intention to enforce this forfeiture is now fixed beyond a doubt; countless ducats are as nothing to him when weighed against the pound of his enemy's flesh. It is still the same Shylock we have seen, only intensified by the terrible purpose in view, and by the maddening influences which have led to this purpose. We call it a murderous intent, and so it is, but to him it is a legalized sacrifice for his revenge, a legalized retribution for his wrongs. A Jewish oath is registered to perform the deadly act; an officer is bespoken; the keen intellect is now bent upon fortifying his legal position, the commanding will lends all its force to the carrying out of this terrible design. I have seen him represented on the stage, in the trial scene, as almost overwhelmed by excitement and passion as he whets his knife, or produces the balances jingling in his trembling hands. I believe this to be a false representation.

> What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong?

or

> My deeds upon my head!
> I crave the law
>
> —IV, i, 89, 206.

are words, among many others coming from his lips, which admit of but one interpretation. He is firm in the belief in his own right, and assured of his legal justification. The only mark of age to be portrayed here is dignity. His words carry with them a feeling of superiority over

the taunting Gratiano—really a feeling of equality with the Duke himself. When his own weapon, the letter of the law, is finally turned against him, then, and only then is he unmanned—completely and suddenly overwhelmed. From a dramatic point of view, it is the sudden extinction of the character, with all its grandeur of strength, and calls more for pity than for ridicule. Avaricious and revengeful though he was, he was more sinned against than sinning. Social ostracism had left him, as it leaves the Jew of to-day, in a position where money was his only power outside of his tribe, and money-getting or nothing must be his trade, plied with a patient thrift and intelligence naturally ripening into avarice as his store increases, and as age crystallizes his habits of mind and of life. Subtly and terribly revengeful he was, but unspeakably maddening was his provocation.

If the popular magazine literature of the day is to be taken as a guide in the study of Shakespeare's characters, we shall soon find ourselves between Scylla and Charybdis in our search for the Shylock of Shakespeare. We are either to degrade him into a clown, or to canonize him as a saint, and if we have carefully read the *Merchant of Venice*, we shall find either of these a very hard thing to do. Our Scylla may be found in *The Century* for March, 1885, and our Charybdis in *The Atlantic* for April, 1886.

In the *Century* article an eminent divine treats of *The Worship of Shakespeare* as a dangerous idolatry of the nineteenth century, and speaks with the zeal of one who has made an important discovery for the benefit of his race. The authorities are numerous and concurrent from different points of view, each of which may be designated by a substantive ending in *ism*. There is Taine, the "naturalist," Jones Very, the "spiritualist," a certain "supernaturalist," nameless, but having serious objections to quotations from Shakespeare in the sermons of clergymen; and last, but greatest, Emerson himself whom we all know to be a grand old optimist, though he is not so designated. But the Sage of Concord is only quoted at the point where, after a dozen or more pages of grand broadness of vision, he, singularly enough, adds some two pages of unexplainable narrowness. These four authorities, fortifying the author's own opinion form what might be called an alembic, or perhaps more properly a Shakespeareometer, by which it is finally determined that "to purely spiritual insight, he" (Shakespeare) "will ever seem defective." The one awful example of the lengths to which the worship of Shakespeare may lead is found in the modern stage representations of the character of Shylock. "As originally designed," says the author, "Shylock was a secondary and incidental personage, intended to represent the comical aspects of the situation." Irving's personation of the character leads to the following reflections:—

Would not the author of the play open his eyes in astonishment if he could see it

acted in New York to-day. The picture of a Jew as cherishing pride of race, or any kind of personal pride, would strike him as inconceivably strange.

This view of *Shylock* appears to be evolved entirely from the author's inner consciousness, and is flashed upon us almost if not altogether as discovery by intuition.

The sole argument in its support is this :—

The Hebrew of Shakespeare's time was not in any respect the Hebrew of ours, and that it is preposterous to apply modern ideas of equity or of pity to the creations of three hundred years ago.

There are certain words to be uttered by Shylock, certain dramatic situations in which he is placed, which, in the author's mind, appear to have nothing to do with the startling conclusion he has reached. Would it not be well to set the works of Taine, Very, and even of Emerson, one side for future reference, and take up *The Merchant of Venice* for one more careful reading before we join in this opinion? After all, is not the play the thing? In the absence of any vestigetof the actual stage traditions of Shakespeare's day, it is a rather bold statement to say that Shylock was "originally designed" as the clown of the play, or something like it, that Shakespeare intended these grand utterances for the mouth of a stage mounteback, or that actions so terribly in earnest should be interpreted by the antics of buffoonery. We are not yet prepared to give up the Shylock of Macklin, of Edmund Kean, of Edwin Booth, of Irving, or to substitute the worship of isms for the worship of Shakespeare.

Taking up the *Atlantic* for April, 1886, we turn, with a feeling of relief, to an article entitled *Shylock* vs. *Antonio. A brief for the plaintiff on appeal.* This is, as its title implies, an *ex parte* statement of the case of Shylock. So far as a layman can discern it appears a perfect model of modern special pleading. As a recreation it may be harmless, if we can only keep in mind the fact that we are playing we are at court, and that we are not studying the dramatic merits of *The Merchant of Venice.* In pleadings of this kind, it is of course the sole object of the lawyer to prove that his client is entirely in the right, usually involving proof that everyone else connected with the case is entirely wrong; and so, of course Shylock is lauded to the skies, while Antonio is set down as a speculator of very dubious honesty, and the trial is characterized as an "illogical tangle of inconsistencies." In his zeal, the attorney for the plaintiff goes so far as to assert in reference to his client's original intention to enforce the forfeiture of the bond, that

if the transaction had only ended here (at the time the loan was first made) unconnected with the subsequent outrages to which he was subjected, it is not too much to infer that the forfeiture would not have been claimed.

But is there not "evidence" to the contrary? Is it not to be found

in his mutterings of hate already quoted? And if this is not enough let us hear what his daughter has heard from his own lips at a time when the episode was "unconnected with the subsequent outrages:"—

> When I was with him, I have heard him swear
> To Tubal, and to Chus, his countrymen,
> That he would rather have Antonio's flesh
> Than twenty times the value of the sum
> That he did owe him.
>
> —III, ii, 286.

This, Shylock has sworn, be it remembered, perhaps in that very oath he speaks of in the trial scene, the oath which would lay perjury upon his soul if he failed to exact the forfeiture of the bond.

No, we cannot canonize Shylock as a saint, any more readily than we can degrade him into a mirth-provoking clown. The attempt to do each of these two things has been productive of, or incidental to, two briliant articles from able pens in two leading periodicals. The effect is as startling as it is evanescent. We look in vain for resulting benefits in the way of new light or new help, and at last ask ourselves, do not such performances as these bear about the same relation to true Shakespearian scholarship which jumping from the Brooklyn Bridge, or shooting the Niagara Rapids in a cork jacket bear to true heroism?

Not even excepting Hamlet, there is no character in Shakespeare's plays which invites more theorizing than Shylock, and theorizing of the most dangerous and misleading kind, too, because, from the nature of the case, as we have just seen, the study is to fit the character to a preconceived theory, rather than to evolve a theory from the study of the character. Even when the latter course is faithfully undertaken, sympathy oftens get the better of judgment. For this reason, the actor's point of view is a vantage-ground in an estimate of Shylock, as, indeed, it is of any dramatic character. With theory as a means rather than an end of study, the actor has nothing to do. He is simply the mouth-piece and interpreter of the author, and his only care is faithfully to put himself in Shylock's place.

The first attempts to reproduce the plays of Shakespeare upon the stage after the re-opening of the theatres in the days of the Restoration, date back to the early part of the eighteenth century. The object at that time seems to have been merely to take Shakespeare's work as a suggestion or possibly a ground-work for something suited to the tastes of theatre-goers of the day. And so, such of the plays as saw the light at that time, appeared in such garbled, mangled, and distorted form that their original was hardly recognizable. No play seems to have suffered more by their treatment than *The Merchant of Venice*, and no character more than Shylock. Among many other additions and perversions, appears a musical masque entitled *Peleus and Thetis*, introducing a banqueting scene in which Shylock, seated at a separate

table, gives a toast to the god Money. In this character Doggett especially contrived to provoke the mirth of the audience, and the play, which had been improved in this way by Lord Lansdowne, held the boards, strangely enough, for two or three decades. But the times were ripening, happily, for something of a different nature from the drama of the Restoration. The night of the fifteenth of February, 1741, was a memorable one in the annals of the English stage. Charles Macklin was the hero of the night, and hero indeed he was, a pioneer in the revival of the drama of Shakespeare. Shylock with the great master's own words once again in his mouth, rendered with tragic force, supplanted, at last, the clown of the day. Like all Macklin's work, it was realistic to the last degree, even to the red hat which he discovered that the Jews of Venice were obliged by law to wear at the time of the story. And better than all, it was a marked success, a grand triumph, even said to have been pronounced by Pope to be the very "Jew that Shakespeare drew." From this time on, for nearly a century, more actors were probably marred than made in their attempts to rival Macklin's performance. In February again, the 26th of February, 1814, Edmund Kean, till then a poor, obscure, little man, was at last accorded the privilege of a *debut* on the London stage. In spite of all opposition, he insisted on appearing in the character of Shylock, in the performance of which Stephen Kemble and Huddart had but recently recorded sad failures. More electrifying, more magnetic than Macklin, Kean owes his fame to the character of his own choosing. It was an intuition of genius which led him to say to his manager, "Shylock or nothing." The manager was saved from impending financial ruin, which the actor's great and sudden success averted.

And so, down to our own day, the great actors still rival the actors of former days in their interpretation of this wonderful character. The adequately marked Judaism of Booth, the scholarly dignity and pride of Irving, furnish new inspirations to the student who like these great actors, will put himself in Shylock's place, and try to understand him.

When we reflect that the Jew of three centuries ago was an outlaw, banished from England by royal edict, the wonder is that Shakespeare could have caught and portrayed this faithful type of a race known only by name in his country. We are tempted to surmise that he went to Venice for his model. But in whatever way the type may have been caught, the portrayal should be set down as the most striking example of the catholicity of Shakespeare's genius. Rising above the prejudices of a day, he has made the Jew of his mimic world the Jew of the real world—a living type of humanity, coming fresher to us through the lapse of ages because bound by the same traditions of race now as ever.

JONATHAN TRUMBULL.

THE EDITORS OF SHAKESPEARE.

XIII. AMBROSE ECCLES.

Ambrose Eccles was born in Ireland, and received his education at the College of Dublin. Little is known concerning him except that he was a man of means, and that he lived at his country seat of Cronroe, where he died in 1809.

He edited three of Shakespeare's plays: *Cymbeline*, *King Lear*, and *The Merchant of Venice*. The two former were first published in Dublin in 1793, and afterwards in London, in 1801. *The Merchant of Venice* was published in Dublin in 1805.

King Lear and *Cymbeline* were issued together in two volumes. As to the reason why these two plays were selected, Eccles stated that "they have generally been judged inferior to few others in poetical excellence and beauty, they likewise appeared, in an eminent degree, to stand in need of that kind of assistance which it has been endeavoured to administer." He believed that the plays had not been properly edited, and that many of the scenes had become transposed through the carelessness of the "editors" of the First Folio. Thus Act I, scene iii, he made I,ii, in *King Lear*; and I,v, he made I,iv. Eleven changes of this kind he adopted in *King Lear*, and fifteen in *Cymbeline*. He adopted Jennens' "sketch of the play" in *King Lear*, and altered it to suit his own changes in the scenes. The notes are printed at the bottom of the page, and consist of a selection of those of former editors, and a goodly number of his own.

The three plays which Eccles published were well edited for the time when he lived, and contain much that is valuable.

XIV. ISAAC REED.

The parents of Isaac Reed were of humble origin, and resided in the parish of St. Dunstan's—in the West, London, where he was born. His father was a baker, and owing to delicate health Isaac's younger years were passed at home. He afterwards went to school at Streatham. He was articled as a clerk to the firm of Perrott and Hodgson, attorneys, and remained with them some time. Subsequently he was

assistant to Mr. Hoskins, a conveyancer, and continued with him for about a year, when he established himself in Gray's Inn, in the same profession. He devoted himself to literature also, however, and his first venture seems to have been the publication of the poetical works of the Hon. Lady Mary Wortley Montague in one volume duodecimo, in 1768. In 1773 he issued a collection of the Cambridge Prize Poems from 1750 to that time; and in 1777 commenced the publication of *The Repository: a Select Collection of Fugitive Pieces of Wit and Humour, in Prose and Verse, by the most eminent Writers*. This work was in four volumes in octavo, and the last volume was issued in 1783. In 1778 he issued an edition of Middleton's *Witch*, and in 1780 he edited *Dodsley's Old Plays*, in twelve volumes, octavo. This work also contained notes, and involved much labor.

In 1782 he issued *Dodsley's Collection of Poems, with Biographical Notes*, in six volumes octavo; and the same year *Biographia Dramatica* in two volumes octavo; and in 1783 he published *Pearch's Collection of Poems*, in four volumes octavo.

He had a large and valuable library, which was especially rich in old English literature. After his death the library was sold at auction, and the sale is referred to by Didbin, in his *Bibliomania*. He died January 5th, 1807, and was buried at Amwell.

His friend George Steevens had published two editions of Shakespeare, in 1773 and 1779, which had been all sold. The booksellers required another edition, and Steevens declined to again act as editor, but suggested Reed's name. In 1785 the work appeared in ten volumes octavo. The title page is as follows:

The Plays of William Shakespeare. In ten volumes. With the Corrections and Illustrations of Various Commentators; to which are added Notes by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens. The Third Edition, Revised and augumented by the Editor of Dodsley's Collection of Old Plays.

ΤΗΣ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΣ ΗΝ, ΤΟΝ ΚΑΛΑΜΟΝ ΑΠΟΒΡΕΧΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΝΟΥΝ.

Vet. Auct. apud Suidam.

MULTA DIES, VARIUSQUE LABOR MUTABILIS ÆVI
RETULIT IN MELIUS, MULTOS ALTERNA REVISENS
LUSIT, ET IN SOLIDO RURSUS FORTUNA LOCAVIT.
Virgil.

London: Printed for C. Bathurst, J. Rivington & Sons, T. Payne & Son, L. Davis, W. Owen, B. White & Son, T. Longman, B. Law, T. Bowles, J. Johnson, C. Dilly, J. Robson, G. G. J. & J. Robson, T. Cadell, H. L. Gardner, J. Nichols, J. Bew, W. Stuart, R. Baldwin, J. Murray, A. Strahan, T. Vernor, J. Barker, W. Lowndes, S. Hayes, G. & T. Wilkie, Scatcherd & Whitaker, T. J. Egerton, W. Fox, and E. Newbery.

MDCCLXXXV.

There is prefixed to Volume I. a well executed engraving from the Chandos portrait, by John Hall. It is however entirely unlike that

painting. The same plates of the Droeshout engraving, and Marshall's copy of it, which were used in Steevens' 1778 edition, are also in this volume. So is the plate of fac-similes of Shakespeare's autographs which was used in that edition.

There is first printed Reed's "Advertisement," which occupies four pages, and is dated November 10th, 1785; then comes Dr. Johnson's preface; which is followed by Steevens' "Advertisement" to the 1778 edition; then comes a list of ancient translations, etc.; and the dedication and preface of the First Folio are followed by the prefaces of Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, and Warburton; then there is given Steevens' "Advertisement" to his "Twenty Plays." Rowe's life of Shakespeare comes next, and the grant of arms to the poet's father; his will, the Stratford Register extracts; commendatory poems; list of ancient editions of the poet's plays; works on the same; extracts from the books of the Stationers' Company; Malone's essay on the order of the plays, etc., follow. Then come the plays, which are printed in the order of the First Folio.

The work is mainly a reprint of Steevens' edition of 1778, and Reed's labors were not very heavy. In his "Advertisement" Reed remarks:

Where the very great and various talents of the last Editor [Steevens], particularly for this Work, are considered, it will occasion much regret to find, that having superintended two Editions of his favourite Author through the press, he has at length declined the laborious office, and committed the care of the present Edition to one who laments with the rest of the world the secession of his predecessor; being conscious, as well of his own inferiority, as of the injury the publication will sustain by the change.

As some alterations have been made in the present Edition, it may be thought necessary to point them out. These are of two kinds, additions and omissions.

The additions are such as have been supplied by the last Editor, and the principal of the living Commentators. To mention these assistances, is sufficient to excite expectation; but to speak of anything in their praise will be superfluous to those who are acquainted with their former labours. Some remarks are also added from new Commentators, and some notices extracted from books which have been published in the course of a few years past.

Of the omissions, the most important are some notes which have been demonstrated to be ill founded, and some which were supposed to add to the size of the volumes without increasing their value. It may probably have happened that a few are rejected which ought to have been retained; and in that case the present Editor, who has been the occasion of their removal, will feel some concern from the injustice of his proceeding. He is however inclined to believe that what he has omitted will be pardoned by the Reader; and that the liberty which he has taken will not be thought to have been licentiously indulged. In all events, that the censure may fall where it ought, he desires it to be understood that no person is answerable for any of those innovations but himself.

It has been observed by the last Editor, that the multitude of instances which have been produced to exemplify particular words, and explain obsolete customs, may, when the point is once known to be established, be diminished by any future Editor, and, in conformity to this opinion, several questions, which were heretofore properly introduced, are now curtailed. Were an apology required on this occasion,

the present Editor might shelter himself under tha authority of Prior, who long ago said,

> That when one's proofs are aptly chosen,
> Four are as valid as four dozen.

The present Editor thinks it unnecessary to say anything of his own share in the Work, except that he undertook it in consequence of an application which was too flattering and too honourable to him to decline. He mentions this only to have it known that he did not intrude himself into the situation. He is not insensible, that the task would have been better executed by many other gentlemen, and particularly by some whose names appear to the notes. He has added but little to the bulk of the volumes from his own observations, having upon every occasion rather chosen to avoid a note, than to court the opportunity of inserting one. The liberty he has taken of omitting some remarks, he is confident, has been exercised without partiality; and therefore, trusting to the candour and indulgence of the public, will forbear to detain them any longer from the entertainment they may receive from the greatest Poet of this or any other nation.

In the above Reed gives a very fair account of his duty as editor of this edition. The work in nearly all particulars is a reprint of Steevens' 1778 edition. Reed added some notes of his own, which are signed "Editor." The fact of his having edited Dodsley's Old Plays, and his general familiarity with the old drama, was of the greatest assistance to him, as it enabled him to add to the illustration of Shakespeare's text in this direction.

In 1803, another edition, edited by Reed, appeared in twenty-one volumes octavo. The title page to Volume I. is as follows:

The Plays of William Shakespeare. In twenty-one volumes. With the corrections and illustrations of various commentators. To which are added notes, by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens. The fifth edition. Revised and augmented by Isaac Reed, with a glossarial index.

ΤΗΣ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΣ ΗΝ, ΤΟΝ ΚΑΛΑΜΟΝ ΑΠΟΒΡΕΧΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΝΟΥΝ.

Vet. Auct. apud. Suidam.

Time, which is continually washing away the dissolute Fabricks of other Poets, passes without Injury by the Adamant of SHAKESPEARE.

Dr. Johnson's Preface.

MULTA DIES, VARIUSQUE LABOR MUTABILIS ÆVI
RETULIT IN MELIUS, MULTOS ALTERNA REVISENS
LUSIT, ET IN SOLIDO RURSUS FORTUNA LOCAVIT.
Virgil.

London: Printed for J. Johnson, R. Baldwin, H. L. Gardner, W. J. & J. Richardson, J. Nichols & Son, F. & C. Rivington, T. Payne, R. Faulder, G. & J. Robinson, W. Lowndes, G. Wilkie, J. Scatcherd, T. Egerton, J. Walker, W. Clarke & Son, J. Barker & Son, D. Ogilvy & Son, Cuthell & Martin, R. Lea, P. Macqueen, J. Nunn, Lackington, Allen & Co., T. Kay, J. Deighton, J. White, W. Miller, Vernor & Hood, D. Walker, B. Crosby & Co., Longman & Rees, Cadell & Davies, T. Hurst, J. Harding, R. H. Evans, S. Bagster, J. Mawman, Blacks & Parry, R. Bent, J. Babcock, J. Asperne, and T. Ostell. 1803.

The title-pages to the other volumes merely have "The Plays of William Shakespeare," the number of the volume, and the contents, besides the names of the publishers as above and the place of publication and date.

There is prefixed to the first volume an engraving of the Felton portrait, by J. Neagle. It is fairly well done, but the expression is not as soft as in the original portrait. Neagle changed the stiff ruff somewhat, to make it look more like a linen collar, and the costume that he added is a plain black gown, entirely different from the Droeshout engraving.

There is a preface by Reed (which he calls an "Advertisement," and the preliminary matter is much the same as in the edition of 1785, with the exception that Malone's historical account of the English stage is reprinted entire, and the additions to it by Steevens' and Chalmers are also given. The plays are arranged very much in the order of the First Folio except that *Macbeth* precedes *King John* and that *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Comedy of Errors* follow *Othello*.

In his preface Reed tells us that this edition contains "the last improvements and corrections of Mr. Steevens, by whom it was prepared for the press." He further remarks that it "is faithfully printed from the copy given by Mr. Steevens to the proprietors of the preceding edition, in his life-time; with such additions as, it is presumed, he would have received had he lived to determine on them himself."

This edition is the foundation on which was built the variorum editions of 1813 and 1821. It contains nearly all the notes that are in the latter, and while the text is not as good as that of 1821, the book is for most purposes very nearly as valuable for reference as the edition of 1821, which has attained the distinction of being called "*the* variorum."

In 1813 this edition was reprinted in twenty-one volumes octavo, the proof-sheets being revised by Mr. Harris, librarian of the Royal Institution. Copies of it were also printed on large paper, in royal octavo. Prefixed to the first volume is an engraving of the Felton portrait, by W. Holl. It is fair, but the soft expression of the original has not been fully preserved.

As before stated Reed's services as editor consisted principally in adding notes from old English literature explanatory of his author's text. The text itself he did not meddle with. While he was somewhat obscured by the greater lights of his day, Steevens and Malone, still his services must not be overlooked, and the praise awarded to him which is his due.

J. Parker Norris.

A SCHOOL OF SHAKESPEARE.

PREFATORY NOTE.—The aim of the following list of questions, or headings for consideration, is to be suggestive and to lead to a close and loving study of *The Merchant of Venice*. The questions do not pretend to be exhaustive of the play; the groups are probably not scientifically complete in themselves, and their sub-divisions may not follow in the logical order; in fact, the whole plan is tentative; but similar questions implying a like method of study in part have brought about good results in my own personal and professional experience; and hence these questions are offered, with some diffidence, to the readers of SHAKESPEARIANA and to lovers of Shakespeare.

The questions do not pretend, again, to lay down the law as to precisely what the analysis of the play reveals, as Shakespeare's distinct purpose and doctrine in writing it. *The Merchant of Venice* is a *work of Art*, thank Heaven! and as indestructible as the English tongue. It is true that *The Merchant of Venice* does deal, as Gervinus suggests, with Property and the Rights of Property as the basis of Society; but it also deals with Human Affections as the basis of Society; and Shylock is punished as much for his sins against these Rights of Affection as he is for his abuse of the Rights of Property. And yet we can hardly say that the theme of the play must, therefore, be the Rights of Property in conflict with the Rights of Affection; any more than we can say that the true theme is Education because it is through the knowledge which is power that Portia is enabled to save her husband's honor and his friend's life; nor yet that the lesson is Justice tempered with Mercy, which Shylock rejects and by which he is finally overcome. It teaches all of these things and much more besides; and it is a dangerous kind of criticism which undertakes to interpret the multiplicity of Shakespeare's human life by translating it into some one plan of Society or of Individuality. These questions, and those to follow on other plays, employ general terms, not to establish preconceived opinions but because it is extremely difficult to get along without general terms. I have no system of Shakespeare to expound. So much by way of prevention of misconception.

The cross-references and illustrations are confined to the play itself

and to Shakespeare's earlier work, because, in the endeavor to learn something of Shakespeare's own growth as well as of his works, it seems wise to take things in their due order; the later plays will come up hereafter. The chronological order of the plays adopted is that given in Professor Dowden's admirable *Shakspere Primer*, which is heartily commended, small as it is, as an agreeable and useful companion in Shakespeare study.

The important thing is first of all to read and study Shakespeare; not to read about him; not to read what his aim may, can, or must have been; but to read in Shakespeare's own words what he means. Let us use, however, the proper helps to understanding his words as he understood them. Thus may Shakespeare truly speak to the Shakespeare within us; thus may the spirit of his mighty genius be imparted—immeasurable benefit—to those eager to receive it. All the needful criticism will come in due time.

It is hard to conceive any greater blessing which could befall the American people than that, beginning in their school-days, they should learn to love and to read habitually all their lives the Plays of William Shakespeare.

Wm. Taylor Thom.

Hollins Institute, Va.

(References are to the *Globe* edition.)

OUTLINE OF A SCHEME FOR A COURSE OF SHAKESPEARE STUDY.

"THE MERCHANT OF VENICE."

I. *The Merchant of Venice* as showing:—

1. Shakespeare's Presentation of *Man the Individual.*

   (*a*) The Various Individualities in the play.

   (*b*) Differences and Effects upon individuals of differences of Age, of Rank, of Social Station, *e. g.*, Antonio and Bassanio.

   (*c*) Effects of Differences of Race and of Race-influence in Beliefs, and in Education, *e. g.*, Shylock and Bassanio.

   (*d*) Consequences of Sex in further modifying such differences. Jessica and Portia.

2. Shakespeare's Presentation of *Man, the Social Being.*

   (*a*) Relations of legally constituted Society and of individual Members of Society to Property and to Law.

   Right of Property to Protection in conflict with Right of the Individual to Protection.

(*b*) Authority of Law and Custom.
Shylock, the alien, invincible as against Antonio the citizen, so long as Custom gives him what seems to be Law on his side.

(*c*) Relations between Higher and Lower Ranks.
The Feudal Society as compared with ours.

(*d*) Influences of long-standing Race-Prejudice.
Shylock, the rich merchant, in but not of his community.

3. Shakespeare's Presentation of *Woman.*

(*a*) Portia as a Type.
Is her intellect masculine?
A young man's Ideal of Womanhood?

(*b*) Jessica and Nerissa as Types.
As to Character and as to Position.

(*c*) All three as indicative of Shakespeare's Period as compared with our own.

4. Shakespeare's Presentation of *Mankind in General.*

(*a*) Man's Need of Affection for a fully developed Life, both in himself as an Individual and as a Social Being.

(*b*) Necessity for and Advantage of kindly, helpful Co-operation in the affairs of daily life, even in those partly or wholly selfish in aim.—In Union is Strength.

(*c*) Character-Progression towards noble Development through the healthy Affections,—Bassanio and Portia; towards ignoble Degradation through over-weening influence of mis-applied Intellect and unhealthy Passion,—Shylock.

(*d*) Dwarfing Effect upon Man's Intellect, as to Thought for himself; and upon Judgment, as to Action, for himself and for others; of Cherished Prejudice, and consequent Punishment both in Thought and in Social Relation.

(*e*) Wrong-doing and Wrong-suffering of Society proceeding from long continued Class or Race Oppression.

(*f*) Need of sound and humanizing Education both for the Individual and for Society.

(*g*) Bassanio, meaning well but acting thoughtlessly, well-nigh destroys his friend and his own peace of mind; Shylock, meaning ill and acting from thought rendered purblind by evil passion, over-reaches and ruins himself; Portia, acting upon the joint impulse of sound head and pure heart shows the Beauty and the Strength of self-development and unselfish devotion united.

II. *The Merchant of Venice* as compared with Shakespeare's *Earlier Work* as to—

1. (*a*) The Setting of the Story.—The Keynote struck.

Compare *Mer. of Ven.* with *L. L. L.* I. i.; *M. N. D.* I. i. and ii; *Two Gent of Ver.* I. i.; *Rich. III.* I. i.; *Rom. and Jul.* I. i. and iii.

(*b*) Selection of the Subject. Skill in combination of existing Materials. Originality?

Compare *Mer. of Ven.* with early *Hist. Plays; L. L. L.*; *M. N. D.*; *Com. of Er.*; *Rom. and Jul.*

(*c*) Issue of the Plot, and Means of bringing it about.

Compare *Mer. of Ven., V,* with last Acts of *L. L. L.*; *T. G. of Ver. Rich. III., Rom. and Jul., King John.*

2. (*a*) Types of Characters presented.

Various nationalities in various plays; Fairy element in *M. N. D.*

(*b*) Characterization of *Dramatis Personæ.*

Superiority of *Mer. of Ven.* over earlier plays in Complexity of Character. Compare Portia and Juliet; Shylock and Richard III.; Launcelot and Launce (*T. G. of Ver.*)

(*c*) Means of Character Development, internal and external.

Antonio and Shylock use the same instrument wealth, to develop their natures in opposite directions. Their separate religious traditions make Shylock wiser about money them Antonio. In *Com. of Er.* accident alone decides which Dromio it is.

3. (*a*) Development of Plot by Characters.

In *Mer. of Ven.*, the plot grows out of the Characters: in earlier plays we find plot and characters largely dependent on incident and contrast.

(*b*) Handling of Secondary Groups of Characters.

Superior Skill shown in contrasting Gratiano and Nerissa, Lorenzo and Jessica with Bassanio and Portia as compared with lovers in *M. N. D.*

(*c*) Use of Secondary Plots.

The troubles of Lorenzo and Jessica add to the effect of the troubles of Bassanio and Portia; Bassanio's success with the Caskets heightens our anxiety for Antonio; the trick of Portia and Nerissa about the rings soothes us after the trial-scene and delights us when they reach Belmont. Compare with all this the less closely knit parts of *M. N. D.*

ANTONIO, THE MERCHANT.

To get a vivid impression of Shakespeare's presentation of any one of his characters, as an Individuality, the simplest, most direct way is to ask, with the Play in hand,—just as the good actor must do

when he seeks to know what appearance and qualities he should exhibit,—"What manner of man does Shakespeare show us he was?"

In the same way, for instance, asking what kind of a man was Antonio, one may follow him through the Play, noticing what he says, what others say of him, how different people and how different events affect him, and putting for consideration such questions as naturally arise.

I, i:—Why was he sad? Was his sadness a mood?—Something rooted in his disposition, or something springing from it? And why? What two causes of it are assigned by Salanio and Salarino? [8–40 and 46.] Did Antonio deny both of these? Do you think the departure of the rest as soon as Bassanio enters significant in any way? Did Gratiano understand Antonio aright in the inferences he seems to draw? [74–76, and 81–102.] How do Antonio and Bassanio take what he said? What did they have to say to each other? Did Antonio expect such a revelation as Bassanio made? [119–121.] Was Bassanio guarded at first? Does Antonio seem to feel he was? [153.] Does Bassanio's tone seem to change somewhat? If it does, where?—and how was it?—and what may it seem to signify of the relations of Antonio, Bassanio and Portia? How does Antonio receive Bassanio's full revelation?

I, iii: What does Shylock have to say of Antonio? How does Antonio speak and act before the Jew? How much of his speech and conduct may you attribute to race prejudice and what remains beyond this to show the innate disposition of the man? Why does Bassanio fear Shylock's bond more than Antonio does?

II, vi, 60–68: Has Antonio's appearance here any bearing on anything besides the conduct of the story?

III, i: Does the conversation of Salarino and Salanio throw any light on anything but the story, and on their own characters?—That is to say, on Antonio's character or his reputation?

III, ii: Is the letter to Bassanio the most intimate revelation given of Antonio's character. [317–324.] What does it lead Bassanio to say of his letter? [267–268.] Of him. [294–298.] Is this consistent with the other conclusions you have drawn?

III, iii, and IV, i: In the scene with the Jew and the jailor how does Antonio act? And what does he say in accepting the issue of events in this scene; and later in the Trial Scene? In urging Bassanio to give up the ring?

V, i: What value have Antonio's last words after the arrival in Belmont?

Welding these dramatic effects together, into what shape has Antonio's character grown before your eyes?

C. P.

SHAKESPEARE SOCIETIES.

It is desired to give, here, serially, account and report of the work of all Societies, Clubs and Classes engaged in studying or reading Shakespeare. Reports of work are wanted, prefaced by some account of the beginning and progress of each Society. Its history, that is to say, is wanted as well as its minutes, news of its studies, or of the investigations it may have made. Each Society, inclined to promote a plan looking to the general good, is invited to send the necessary data as to :

1. When it was formed?

2. How it was organized?—Constitution, or general rules?

3. By whom and where?

4. Its present list of numbers, designating officers.

5. Its way of working. Difficulties. Changes found advisable, and why. With observations on any of these points that may be thought of interest, and with report of work in hand.

The Montreal Shakespeare Club.—The origin of the Shakespeare Club of Montreal was on this wise : "In 1873, '74 and '75,"—its Honorary Secretary, Mr. R. W. Boodle, writes, in reply to Shakespeariana's inquiry,—"I had belonged to a Shakespeare Club in Oxford University that met privately on Tuesday nights in different men's rooms. When I came to Canada I resolved to start a Club here in Montreal, but did not succeed in striking the right kind of men till the year 1882, in February, when four of us met, Messrs. H. Abbott, R. D. McGibbon, R. G. Goggs and myself, of whom only the first and last are now members of the Club. I was appointed Secretary, and have continued so ever since. The calendar I send of the Montreal Club explains its work." The first session (1882) was spent in studying *Romeo and Juliet*, *Measure for Measure*, and a *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. "The Social Question suggested by the Play" "Angelo" and the "Ground tone of the Play" in *Measure for Measure*, receiving the attention of E. W. Arthy, R. G. Goggs and R. W. Boodle. Of Sessions II. (1882–83) and III. (1883–84) accounts are given in Shakespeariana, Vol. I. pp.

26, 60, 93, 160 and 199. *Antony and Cleopatra* was the first play studied in the fourth session (1884–85), report thereon is given in SHAKESPEARIANA, Vol. II, p. 49,; *Henry IV.*, parts I. and II., were then studied; *The Merry Wives of Windsor* followed, and "Falstaff," by the Rev. Canon Norman, and by J. S. McLennan; "The Percy Family and Hotspur," by W. McLennan; "Prince Hal," by E. Lafleur, and "Mrs. Page and Mrs. Ford," by F. McLennan were the main divisions of the subject considered. The work done on the succeeding plays, *Othello* and *Twelfth Night* was indicated in reports given in SHAKESPEARIANA, Vol. II., pp. 399 and 597. The study of *Twelfth Night* opened, the following four plays concluded the work of Session V., (1885–86).

Cymbeline: "Introductory Remarks on the Play," C. H. Gould; "Jealousy in Shakespeare," E. W. Arthy; "Imogen," H. Abbott; "Posthumus," N. J. Rielle; "Two Notes on the Play," R. W. Boodle.

King Henry V: "General Remarks on the Play," Rev. Canon Norman; "Henry V," A. Parker; "Fluellen," F. T. Short.

Coriolanus: "Introductory Essay," F. T. Short; "General Remarks on the Play" Rev. Canon Norman; "Coriolanus," N. J. Rielle; "Tullus Aufidius," A. D. Nicolls; "Volumnia," C. A. Duclos.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona: "Valentine," W. de M. Marler. The following Essays were also read before the Club during the Session: "Falstaff's Nose: a *jeu d'esprit*," C. E. Moyse; "A Defence of Hamlet's *To be or not to be* against Goldsmith's criticism," Ven. Archd. Leach; "Shakespeare at Dead Hos' Crick," J. E. Logan; "The Development of the Shakespearian Drama," R W. Boodle.

The programme of work for the present session was printed in the August number of this Magazine. The Club is now engaged in studying *The Merchant of Venice*. Its general method of proceeding is to "read a play through, discussing it scene by scene, from every point of view. This takes from four to five evenings. (The work is varied by social pleasures. Several of our members are capital singers and pipes and Bacchus are not out of order.) Then, as recapitulation and summary, a series of essays or notes on the play follow. Our members, you will see by the rules, are limited, (to fifteen) and we have always a large number outside who want to come in at the first vacancy. Rule XI, (which reads: 'In the event of a member missing two meetings in succession, it shall be in the discretion of the Club to notify the Secretary to drop his name,') is strictly enforced against anyone who has not very strong claims on the score of ability as a worker or writer." It may be added that meetings are held weekly from the second Monday in September until May, each member in turn taking the chair. The Secretaryship and the Chairmanship are the only officers for which the Constitution provides. There

are now besides the fifteen regular members, seven honorary members, who have helped to make this Club distinguished for its faithful and enthusiastic work.

A San Francisco Shakespeare Class.—For some time past, Miss L. B. Easton has been conducting Shakespearian Class-work with marked success. The following account of the class she led during the past year, was in a letter, not intended for publication, but it contains so many suggestions likely to prove of great value in showing how to begin work of the same kind, or in pointing out some new path to pleasurable profit, that it is copied here.

* * "My class comprises about a dozen ladies, and we meet on one afternoon of each week; the lesson occupies nearly two hours, and we devote five hours to each play, one to each act.

The first half-hour is devoted to answering the questions given out at the previous lesson, each lady answering in turn. Each lady prepares only one question, and her question is different from those of the other ladies, but she has the benefit of hearing the others recite, and may prepare on all the questions if she wishes. The questions are general in their character; e. g. "Give an outline of Act. I," that is, tell the story of the play so far as it goes in that act. "When was the play written?" Is it in the first folio?' 'Second?' Third?' 'Give three quotations from Act I.' 'Paraphrase into English prose the passage from —to—.' 'Describe the moonlight garden scene,' *Merchant of Venice*, etc., etc. Few questions are given as to the meaning of the passages, that being left for me to take up. The questions for the following lesson having been given, we then open books, and now *my* work begins. I real aloud certain scenes, as chosen by the class, and then take up the whole act from the beginning, explaining, calling attention to beauties, asking opinions, comparing passages, and in fact throwing all possible light upon the act under consideration. We have animated discussions, and the time passes only too swiftly.

This is the *general* work of each act, but in addition to this we have the following:—

First, If the play be an historical one, I give an introductory talk from memory; for instance, in *Julius Cæsar*, I gave a brief outline of the main points in Roman history, down to the period when the play opens, (including a sketch of the political organization of Rome during the Republican Era,) and a brief outline of Cæsar's life.

Second, At the close of every play we have, (a) the placing of quotations given out at the previous lesson, each lady having three, and telling where the passage occurs, who says it, and under what circumstances; and, (b) each lady has one character to sum up, either from memory or from written notes, her idea of the character as drawn from the play (or from history), telling, or judging from, what he

says, what he does, and what others say about him. These characters are assigned when we begin the play, so that each lady is on the look-out for her particular one all the way through. Of course, this last lesson is the most interesting one of all, and much lively discussion is evoked.

For text-books the class use Rolfe principally, also Dowden's *Shakspere Primer*. I use Rolfe, Hudson, Thom, Cl. Press, Dowden's *Mind and Art*, and everything else I can lay my hands on.

Allow me to anticipate an objection that might be made to my giving only one question, and that a different one, to each lady. I can only answer that should I demand all the work from each one, the class would be very likely to go to pieces. Married ladies have so many claims upon their time, material, domestic, and social, that one has to handle them very gingerly, in order to obtain any results whatever. Especially in a city like this, with its great distances, out-of-door life, and kaleidoscopic change of population and interests. A long experience with classes of this kind suggests this as the very best course for me. My classes are always very enthusiastic, and seem especially pleased that they learn and remember so much." * *

THE DRAMA.

MR. LAWRENCE BARRETT'S SHYLOCK.—The studious, skilled, and fairly accompanied performances of *Hamlet*, *Julius Cæsar*, *Richard III*, and *The Merchant of Venice* which Mr. Barrett has given in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, and will continue during the season, deserve the encouragement and attention of all readers of Shakespeare who care for their poet's highest gift,—the dramatic mirroring of human nature.

The Merchant of Venice is, strictly speaking, not the due title of Mr. Barrett's representation of that play. *Shylock* suits it better, for Shylock's part in it is the main interest, forced to stay in the front all through, not only by reason of Mr. Barrett's superior interpretation, but because the story is curtailed in its main flow towards Belmont and "fair Portia." The charming fifth act, which so ideally and joyously rounds out the comedy, is altogether cut, and only a ragged edge here and there, and a consciousness of inconsequence, in scenes not wholly dedicated to the Jew, remain vaguely to remind us of the perfect whole we miss. This is certainly not as it best would be, but appreciating the high average of support given, thanks evidently to Mr. Barrett's painstaking management, it would be churlish not to give thanks, in the face of this lack we feel, for an initial American representation, now, of a Shakespearian play not

propped up by the usual high star and cheap straw combination. As for the Jew, him we have and he is worth our gaze.

Tall, moving with slow strength across the boards in front of the scene that does duty for the Rialto, standing in a quietude almost statuesque in its pose, robed in his black Jewish gaberdine bordered with red, and marked with a red cross on the elbow, a black and yellow cap on his grey, bent head, his richly jewelled hands betraying the nervous eagerness of his nature as they clutch and twine upon his long knotted staff, with the withdrawn look of his strong featured face, and the reserved intelligence dwelling in his eyes, Lawrence Barrett's Shylock, it may be seen, wants neither dignity nor originality. The shabby meanness which he avoids in his dress he avoids also in his conduct and speech.

Three thousand ducats; well,

I, iii.

he says almost absently.

Ay, sir; for three months,

repeats the young Venetian gallant, who looks frivolous by the side of him.

Shylock.—For three months; well.
Bassanio.—For the which,, as I told you, Antonio shall be bound.
Shylock.—Antonio shall become bond; well,

he tells the words over slowly, monotonously, absently still, but no one would think him unattentive to their remotest possibility of meaning.

May you stead me? Will you pleasure me? Shall I know your answer?

pursues the brave Bassanio half impatiently

"Three thousand ducats," returns Shylock, imperturbably, "for three months, and Antonio bound." The thought of Antonio bound is a swee t morsel under his tongue, but he rolls it out with no vulgar gusto, b ut meditatively as does he who makes calculations wisely on two sides and is not easily misled to injudicious hopes.

Antonio is a good man,—

he continues with an accent of over-caution, which alone tells the tale of the thoughts he has been revolving, without the further explanation he vouchsafes in answer to Bassanio's quick question :—

Have you heard any imputation to the contrary?

Ho, no, no, no, no, no; my meaning in saying he is a good man, is to have you understand me, that he is sufficient yet his means are in supposition; he hath an argosy bound to Tripolis, another to the Indies; I understand, moreover, upon the Rialto, he hath a third at Mexico, and a fourth for England, and other ventures he

hath, squandered abroad. But ships are but boards, sailors but men: there be land rats and water-rats, water-thieves and land thieves, I mean pirates; and there is the peril of waters, winds and rocks. The man is notwithstanding, sufficient. Three thousand ducats: I think I may take his bond.

Be assured you may,—

Bassanio returns lightly,

I *will* be *assured* I may; and that I may be *assured*, I will *bethink* me,

answers Shylock with rather more emphasis and effect of being conscious of his interlocutors' actual presence than he has shown hitherto.

His next answer to Bassanio's invitation,—

If it please you to dine with us, &c.

is scarcely more impatient or louder in tone, it is merely gravely contemptuous.

***

To this low tone the key is pitched throughout. The Jew's purpose is kept under, though in hand, only ready in case the occasion calculated as possible shall come. In the speech,

> Signor Antonio, many a time and oft
> In the Rialto you have rated me
> About my money and my usances:
> Still have I borne it with a patient shrug;
> For sufferance is the badge of all our tribe.
>
> I, iii, 101.

Mr. Barrett's rendering was pervaded with the subdued vehemence of a man whose sincerity, sensitively restrained by habits of caution and remembrance of many hurts helplessly received, allowed itself a guarded chance to have its say out in jnstification of himself to a man he bore "a lodged hate and a certain loathing." "For sufferance is the badge of all our tribe," he repeated with bitter weariness, significantly laying one hand upon his sleeve to show the red cross he wore there. Though Antonio had rated him often about his usances, these, the Jew's only permitted source of power had now caused the heedless Christian to bring suit to him. This alone was a kind of satisfaction to the Jew, only a lesser triumph than the one he gloats over when Tubal comforts his lament about his ducats and his daughter with the announcement that Antonio has had ill luck too. His nature is shown through it all not merely as revengeful, hard, and narrow; his hardness is shown as partly due to the shield his pride has made for his sensitiveness, his revenge is shown to be the issue of a malice grounded on a reasonable and well-thought-out grievance, from the Jews's point of view, toward Antonio:—

I will have the heart of him if he forfeit; for were he out of Venice, I can make what merchandise I will.

III, i, 109.

Therefore, with all the repulsion we feel for Shylock's narrowness, his sordid mind, and the evil bias of his heart exhibited so miserably when he says,—

> The curse never fell upon our nation till now: I never felt it till now: two thousand ducats in that, and other precious, precious jewels. I would that my daughter were at my foot and the jewels in her ear! etc,—
>
> III, i, 72.

still, we are made to feel how unjustly he has been baited and badgered.

Mr. Barret also pictures before us a Shylock who restrains his eagerness this side of tremulousness, by so much the more heightening his intensity; who retains a dignity of old age in his outward guise and the dignity of a rooted purpose too wise to unfold itself abruptly even in the growing tightening of suspense in the trial scene.

It is, in a word, Mr. Barrett's glory in this part to have given us that Shakespearian refinement and truth of characterization which permits us to understand and to appreciate the peculiar justification and temptation the man had whose deed is yet repulsive and condemnable.

The nervelessness, the collapse of purpose, but not of the mind which has so quickly taken in the full bearing of his absolute defeat, almost seems worthy of the pity we are wont to give another aged sufferer, tottering King Lear, when Shylock begs the Duke, pausing often, with visible effort,

> I pray you give me leave to go from hence;
> I am not well; send the deed after me,
> And I will sign it.

"HAMLET" ON THE FRENCH STAGE.

The French Version of the greatest of Shakespearian Dramas, brought out, on Tuesday night, the 28th of Sept., at the Théâtre Français, is an old friend with a new face.

The adventures of the older version which was the joint product of the elder Dumas and M. Paul Meurice, are curious and interesting. It was read at the Français while Dumas was absent from Paris. The committee agreed to accept it with alterations. Dumas, when he heard this, was savage, and ironically complimented M. Buloz, the manager, on having agreed to accept Shakespeare—with corrections. The authors then had it played in a country theatre at St. Germain, the critics being invited. Everybody was enchanted. Rouvière made an admirable Hamlet; Ophelia being Mlle. Person, who had received lessons from Miss Smithson, the English actress, whom Berlioz married. Towards the end of 1847 *Hamlet* was played successfully

at the Théâtre Historique, and afterwards at the Odéon. In 1867 it was revived at the Gaîté by Mme. Judith.

The management of the Français, it is said, have long intended to give *Hamlet*, and in M. Perrin's time the dresses and costumes had been designed for that purpose. It was reserved, however, for M. Jules Claretie, himself a man of letters and an ardent admirer of Shakespeare, to superintend the realization of this long cherished project, with the aid too of the collaborator with Dumas, M. Paul Meurice, who survives and who has revised and altered the play so as to fit it for the classic boards of the Rue Richelieu.

The original aim of the authors was the bold one of improving *ce barbare* Shakespeare, and the great feature of their adaptation was to change the *dénouement*. Hamlet escaped the ordeal untouched by the poisoned foil, and, as the other *dramatis personæ* were expiring, the Ghost once more made his appearance, and, as it were, sat in judgment upon them. He pardoned his erring wife, bade Laertes be of good hope, and consigned the guilty King to everlasting perdition. Then Hamlet, confessing his want of firmness, asked his father what punishment was in store for him, to which the Ghost replied, "*Tu vivras*," and the curtain fell. There can be no doubt that this *dénouement* was powerfully effective, and it in no small degree contributed to the success of the piece, which was considerable, in spite of the street agitations which then prevailed, the preliminary rumblings of the storm which two months later swept away Louis Philippe's Throne.

In the version produced at the Français, according to the correspondent of the London *Standard*, the sensational *dénouement* is suppressed, and the curtain falls upon the last words of Hamlet; "*The rest is silence.*" Several other alterations have also been made, with the object of adhering more closely to the text of Shakespeare, some of which are decidedly for the better. Thus the tragedy now opens with the solemn scene on the platform of the Castle, between Bernardo, Marcellus, and Horatio, which Dumas and Meurice had struck out. The next scene, an interpolation of the French authors, thoroughly French in taste and treatment, might have been eliminated with advantage. In this scene, Hamlet, after showing himself deeply impressed at Horatio's description of the Ghost's appearance, and at the very time when he is looking forward to encounter the dread apparition, is made to indulge in a sentimental and playful flirtation with Ophelia, concluding with a formal declaration of love, and handing to her the sonnet, "Doubt thou the stars are fire."

Many of the subtle and fantastic lines and passages which tell on the English stage are omitted, which is a drawback in the estimation of British spectators of the adaptation. Thus, after the play, when the King calls for lights and goes away, Hamlet, instead of bursting into the exuberant joy at having sent the shaft home, which

Mr. Wilson Barrett is fond of displaying, and declaiming the lines, "Why, let the stricken deer go weep," simply says to Horatio, "Le crime est manifeste." There were similar eliminations in the part of Ophelia, which Mlle. Reichemberg well sustained. Thus the charming farewell "Good night, ladies; good night, sweet ladies," was merely "Bonsoir, bonsoir, ma chère dame." The play is got up on a scale of splendour seldom attempted at the Comédie Française. The palace interiors, with their rich tapestries and stained glass windows, are marvels of scenic art, and the costumes are gorgeous in the extreme. Mlle. Reichemberg, the Ophelia, is, unlike Sarah Bernhardt, content with but one dress, a delicate light pink with a broad trimming of white fur round the neck. In the mad scene of course she dresses in the orthodox white robes. The platform on which the Ghost appears is most picturesque. Of course, to all English playgoers the great attraction is the acting of the chief part, and his impersonation of Hamlet stamps M. Mounet-Sully as an artist of very high merit. He adopts the idea that Hamlet's madness is only simulated, and his treatment of some of the best known situations is original. This is especially the case in the famous "To be or not to be" monologue, which is not delivered at the audience, as is too frequently the case, but conveys the impression of being the meditation of a man communing with himself. It made a deep impression on the audience. He commences it standing, with his hand resting on the back of a chair, into which he presently sinks, and with the closing words throws his head back and shuts his eyes as in a dream. His acting in the play scene was also most powerful, and his exultation at the success of his stratagem was admirably expressed, and was uproariously applauded. The scene with his mother was also a fine a fine place of acting. He embraces her when she expresses repentance, and the pathos of his tone and manner created considerable emotion. In short, M. Sully's Hamlet stamps him as the great French tragedian of the present day. The veteran Got was an excellent Polonius, and Coquelin the younger provoked laughter in the grave-digging scene. One of the great attractions is the duel, which is admirably arranged, and of itself would secure a run for the piece.

The manner in which they play is put upon the stage, the care and talent with which even the minor parts are filled, are admirable; but a special tribute of praise must be paid to M. Maubant, whose noble presence gives great effect to the Royal Ghost. M. Meurice, as a translator, had a herculean task to perform and that he attempts to render Shakespeare into French Alexandrines does not lessen its difficulties. On the whole, it may be honestly stated that few sincere students of Shakespeare can witness the performance of *Hamlet* by the company of the first dramatic establishment in Europe without deriving the greatest satisfaction.

The principal *rôles* were personated as follows: Hamlet, M. Mounet-Sully; Polonius, M. Got.; Horatio, M. Baillet: the King, M. Silvain; the Ghost, M. Maubant; Gravedigger, M. Coquelin the younger; Ophelia, Mlle. Reichemberg; the Queen, Mme. Agar; while Mlle. Hadamard, who made the *debut* at the Français about a fortnight since, was the Player-Queen, called in the French version Baptista.

LITERARY NOTES

This autumn brings in a full harvest home of editions of Shakespeare, new, and old, or renewed. Houghton Mifflin & Co. announce a new issue, on somewhat thinner paper than before, and $2.00 cheaper than before, of their Riverside Shakespeare, edited by Richard Grant White. It was formerly published in two forms, it will be remembered, in three volumes at $7.50 (in cloth), and in six at $12.00. The new edition is also in six volumes, but the price is $10.00. The text and the notes of this edition hold unimpeached rank for their accurate care and for their insight, and the decrease in price will do good service if it brings this valuable edition closer to popular favor.

The Bankside Shakespeare. The Histories, Tragedies and Comedies of William Shakespeare, as presented at the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres, circa, 1591–1623. Being the text furnished the Players, in parallel pages with the first revised text of 1623, with Critical Introductions, will be published also by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. This is the *edition de luxe* of the Plays which SHAKESPEARIANA announced in the September number the New York Shakespeare Society had in hand.

It is designed, its projectors say, by the arrangement of its text in parallel pages with the first folio text of Heminge and Condell, to illustrate the *growth* of a Shakespearian play. The critical introductions will be furnished by persons who have carefully investigated this field of Shakespeare study, and in every case will be exclusive of material within the range of the critical notices of other editions. The edition is limited to five hundred copies, the price of which to subscribers will be $2.50 a volume.

Each volume, printed on laid paper and bound in boards, uncut, will contain one play. The first play will be *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, which is now in press. This play, it is announced, has been prepared under the direction of Mr. Appleton Morgan, whose special study for years has been the phenomena of this *building* of the Shakespeare plays from earlier and contemporary models, incidents and suggestions. *The Taming of the Shrew*, the second play of the

Series, will be considered in a similar way by Mr. Albert R. Frey of the Astor Library, *The Taming of a Shrew* the doubtful quarto of 1594 being contrasted with the text of the Play in the Folio. *Love's Labour's Lost* will be the third play issued.

The Fifth edition of the Dyce Shakespeare is now ready. The concluding tenth volume having been issued late in September, by Sonnenschein & Co., of London. (Price 9 s).

The Reader's Shakespeare is the name given an edition to be printed from the University Press types, of Oxford, published by Mr. Walter Smith, of London.

Its main features are an unexpurgated text, given with such emendations of doubtful or corrupt passages as seemed preferable after careful collection of standard editions ; no notes; and the distinguishing of all extraneous matter from Shakespeare's own words by the printing of such interloping matter as is necessary in italics. The first volume, out last month, contained the five plays usually given first in standard editions. The second volume containing the succeeding five: *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Midsummer Nights' Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice* and *As You Like It* will be issued this month.

Vols. IV., V., Histories, Vols. VI.-VIII., Tragedies, and Vol. IX., Songs, Sonnets and Poems, will follow monthly. The price will be 6 s. a volume. Seventy-five copies on large paper, and numbered, price one guinea each volume, will be issued to subscribers only.

A re-issue of *Bowdler's Family Shakespeare* in twelve sixpenny monthly parts is announced by Messrs. Ward, Lock & Co., of London and New York. Mr. Podsnap's "Young Person" is especially cared for in this edition, it will be remembered, or as the announcement puts it, though "nothing is added to the original text, those words and expressions are omitted which cannot with propriety be read aloud in a family."

A new library edition, in two volumes, of the complete works of William Shakespeare, edited by Samuel Phelps, with notes, is published also by the same house.

Macbeth is the last issue of the cheap and excellent National Library. Cassell & Co. (price, 10 cts.)

The Annals of the Life and Works of William Shakespeare, written by J. C(undell), a descendant of one of his fellowes to whom he bequeathed xxvi s. Viij apeece to buy them ringes. Illus. sm. post 8vo. clo. Price, 3*s.* 6*d.*, Messrs. Sampson, Low, Marston & Co., of London, have nearly ready. Notices of various facts lately discovered, bearing on the history of the poet, are promised, with illustrations of Stratford-upon-Avon and of the London Play-houses of

the time. An Appendix will give a list of all the quarto editions of the plays and of the first folios. A few copies on larger paper will be issued, with photographs. Price, 5*s*. a volume.

Familiar Talks on Some of Shakespeare's Comedies, by Mrs. E. W. Latimer, was issued last month by Roberts Bros., of Boston.

The many exquisite songs scattered throughout the plays of Shakespeare, the less elegant, but scarcely less interesting series of droll catches, and the "taking" snatches of widely-known folk-songs that bubble out upon the merry lips of Shakespeare's clowns and wise men, rich as they are with reference to the folk-lore and the popular music of the time, have not yet been made to yield their full story. This is, perhaps, partly because exactly that of which Mr. Barrett's proposed new book treats, *The Historical Development of Glees and Part-Songs* has been hitherto neglected. Mr. William Alexander Barrett took his degree in the Science of Music from Oxford University, he is now Vicar Choral of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and his training and bent have been such as to fit him for his chosen task which, at the point of its relation to Shakespearian Glees, is both a fresh and an interesting field. Longmans & Co., of London, announce this book as in the press. It will trace the growth of the Glee, an item of musical composition peculiarly English, from the earliest time, through the various forms of vocal music to its final state. It will include references to the old harmonists of the thirteenth century, the composers of the madrigals, Flemish, French, Italian and English, of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the catches of the seventeenth century, the glee-writers of the eighteenth and part-song writers of the nineteenth centuries, with biographical sketches and critical notices of the several examples of which special mention will be made.

The Realms of gold. The Song Books of the Elizabethan Age selected and edited by Mr. A. H. Bullen will meet Mr. Barrett's History of Glees on congenial ground. It will be a dainty volume in cloth, small post 8vo, on hand-made paper, printed at the Chiswick press, the edition being limited to 500 copies and the type distributed. (Price 10*s*. 6*d*. net.)

The spacious Times of Queen Elizabeth offer us fuller echoes and new right royal riches through the important and scholarly task Mr. A. H. Bullen has made his peculiar labor of love. The Prospectus, dated Oct. 1886, of The New Edited and Complete Editions of the Elizabethan Dramatists received from the publisher, John C. Nimmo, 14 King William street, Strand, London, is itself an attractive setting forth of the work in hand. The volumes already issued are *The Works of Christopher Marlowe* in three volumes. *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, in eight volumes.

The Works of Thomas Marston, in three volumes, are now announced. In March 1887, will appear *The Works of Thomas Dekker*, in four volumes, and in the autumn, a year hence, a crowning labor, now in process, will find result in *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*. Massinger's part in these plays will be closely considered. And his own work and that other dramatists of this Period will be taken up in due order. Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. are the American publishers of this series, the uniform price of which is 7s 6d. net, or $3 each volume. A Large Paper edition is also issued.

Another edition of the Best Plays, unexpurgated, of the Old Dramatists under the name of *The Mermaid Series*, edited by Havelock Ellis is planned for publication by Mr. T. Fisher Unwin, the London publisher who has lately assumed charge of the English edition of *The Century*. The series will be issued in half-crown monthly vols. post 8vo, each volume containing about 400 pp. The order of publication as proposed is as follows:

Marlowe, edited by Havelock Ellis, with a general introduction by J. A. Symonds; Massinger, edited by Arthur Symons; Middleton, with an introduction by A. C. Swinburne; Beaumont and Fletcher, 2 vols., edited by J. St. Loe Strachey; Webster and Cyril Tourneur, edited by J. A. Symonds; Shirley, by Edmund Gosse; Dekker, by Ernest Rhys; Arden of Feversham and other plays attributed to Shakespeare, by Arthur Symons; Heywood, by J. A. Symonds; Ford, by Havelock Ellis, to be followed by Ben Jonson, Chapman, Marston, William Rowley, Field, Dryden, Otway, Lee Congreeve, &c.

Among other announcements of books of interest to the student of Shakespeare's Drama or of Shakespeare's Century are two volumes of the series of *English Worthies*, edited by Mr. Andrew Lang; *Garrick* by Mr. W. H. Pollock, and *Sir T. More*, by Mr. J. Cotter Morison. These will be issued during the present season, by Longmans. The last volume of this series, *Ben Jonson*, by Mr. J. A. Symonds, recently issued, follows worthily in the train of its predecessor, *Raleigh*, by Mr. Edmund Gosse, which was issued in July.

On such subjects as these, thanks to the loving research of scholars, the latest work, like the latest work on a scientific subject, is the most valuable for the student seeking the fullest information, and for knowledge both of Sir Walter Raleigh and of rare Ben Jonson, the altogether fresh data that such literary interpreters as Mr. Gosse and Mr. Symonds can bring into due relation with that of the old memoirs, is simply indispensable.

The volumes of this series are published in convenient crown octavo form, (price 2s. 6d. or 75 cents.)

Mr. J. A. Symond's study of Elizabethan times is bearing fruit abundantly this season. He adds to the volume on Ben Jonson,

noticed above, the Plays and Poems of Ben Jonson, Selected, with an introduction, to be ready by the last of this month, published by Walter Scott, of London. (Price, in cloth, 1 s.); and another volume on Sir Philip Sydney to be published later in the season by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., of London and New York.

Two hundred and fifty copies of *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* By Reginald Scot, Esq.; Being a reprint of the first edition published in 1584. Edited with Notes, Glossary, and introduction, By Brinsley Nicholson, M. D., are issued by Mr. Elliot Stock, of London. This curious book is full of interest to students of quaint superstitions and of folk-lore, and scarcely less, it follows, to the student of Shakespeare. For, though Reginald Scot wrote to discover and expose the "coosenage" of sundry "bedivilments," his skepticism is as naive as the belief of his generation, and his book gives such a bodying forth of the conditions of his day and the feeling which prevailed at the close of the sixteenth century that to read it is to strike familiarly the very "tune of the time and habit of encounter" from which Shakespeare wrote.

Dr. Nicholson, in his valuable notes, has called attention to many kindred phrases and facts in Scot and in Shakespeare and has in many ways enhanced the worth of the book to scholars.

Professor Henry Morley's work in literary and historical criticism is of such a character that students will anticipate both profit and pleasure of the highest kind in his forthcoming work, *English Writers*, an attempt toward a history of English Literature. For many years past Professor Morley has had this work in contemplation, all his previous work,—not only in his position as Professor of English Literature in the University College, London, but also in the many other lines in which his scholarship and literary ability have been exercised,—contributing its efficacy toward making this result of his labor of especial value. Vol. I., which Cassell & Co. announce for publication in November, will embrace the period from the earliest time of literary growth in England to the reign of Alfred. This volume will be the first of a series of about twenty volumes, according to the original design, planned in 1864, to be issued half-yearly in November and May of each year. The whole is intended to form a continuous work, but as the volumes will be grouped in sections, each may be read as a distinct history of a period. (Vol. I., Cassell & Co., London and New York. 400 pp., crown, 8vo, price, 5 s.)

Society in the Elizabethan Ages, with several coloured plates derived from original drawings and documents, figures prominently among the announcements of new books in the press of Swan Sonnenschein & Co., of London. The work is by Hubert Hall, of Her Majesty's Public Record Office.

SHAKESPEARIANA IN CURRENT MAGAZINES AND PAPERS.—Professor Ernest Whitney, of Yale College, in the *New Englander* for October, *Article IV.—Shakspere's Julius Cæsar*, (pp. 862–867), makes out so clear a case against the present division of this Play that scarcely a point may be found for dissent from his conclusions.

The main considerations urged are as follows. "When Shakespeare wrote *Henry IV.* he was conscious of the excellence of his subject matter and the effective novelty of his method of treatment," and daring to combine what no one had thought of combining in a historical play,—the comic and the historic elements, "he produced the most entertaining of all dramatic productions." Resting easily upon his power he stretches out "through two delightful plays, matter which might have been compressed into one." Not yet did he know his power. But thenceforth, his work shows "a struggle to express all that seems worth expressing, and yet to keep within limits, to overmaster the "'plethora of thought,'" which almost over-masters him, and,—assured, by his past work, resulting in supremacy, of the wealth that lay potential within him'—"to hasten on to such subjects as awaited him in *Macbeth, Lear, Othello*," and the yet unwritten plays.

"Bearing in mind the double play of *Henry IV.*, or the trilogy of *Henry V.*, "it may be understood readily that when Shakespeare first thought of *Julius Cæsar* he may have intended to make at least two connected plays." Then, under pressure of his brewing plans, or perhaps of some demand to furnish a single play at short notice,

He rigidly condensed all his material into one play, yet not so rigidly but that part of his original plan is still apparent.

The fact that in this play there are three strong dramatic points,—the death of Cæsar, the infuriated yet "abjectly passive" passion of the multitude, and the deaths of Brutus and Cassius,—"challenges investigation." These three divisions are marked further.

With the assassination of Cæsar there disappear from the play, Artemidorus, Casca, Cicero, Cinna the conspirator, Decius Brutus, Flavius, Ligarius, Marullus, Metellus Cimber, Popilius Lena, Publius, Trebonius, the Soothsayer, Calpurnia, and Portia—all the characters thus far introduced except Antony, Brutus, Cassius, Lucius, and the citizens. At the second climax one new character, Cinna the poet, is introduced, but he and the whole body of citizens disappear from the play immediately. In the third part we have the vacant places filled with thirteen new characters, Cato, Claudius, Clitus, Dardanius, Lepidus, Lucillus, Messala, Octavius, Pindarus, Strato, Titinius, Varro, and Volumnius, and the opposing armies.

The drama then is naturally divided into two parts at the end of Act III., or into three parts by another break at the beginning of the second scene of Act III. The disregard of the unities of time and place is to be noticed. The action of the third part begins after an interval of about eighteen months, and the scene is shifted from Rome to Macedonia. Yet of all Shakespeare's tragedies *Julius Cæsar* is often pronounced the most perfect in composition. This is true and not true. Whether Shakespeare at first intended to make two, or possibly three plays on the subject, one may reasonably question.

As to the division of the play into acts :

There seems to be no dramatic or other reason for the present major division between Acts I. and II. There is no natural or dramatic break of importance until the end of Act II., Scene 2. But there is a strong reason for the inclusion of these first four scenes in one group. They form an act complete in itself, the effect of which is injured by the present partition. In this first act we are then shown the Roman people and their idol in the enjoyment of peace and prosperity. But jealousy and envy are there, and the conspiracy begins. The restless energy of Cassius, the close dependence of incident on incident in winning Brutus to the conspiracy, all these are too closely connected to be put in separate acts. The interest in Cassius' tirelessness, and the feeling of intense anxiety which is especially worked upon, is materially lessened by a full stop after Act I., Scene 3. There is no resting place reached until the end of the next scene: and most certainly the first act should terminate there. * * * When Brutus, "Cæsar's angel," is won over and assumes the leadership of the conspiracy against his dearest friend with the closing words of the act, "Follow me, then," you will feel that one stage in the development has been passed. The act is of ordinary length, and the change from Brutus to Cæsar is an important break. The minor conspiracy against Brutus has succeeded; we now follow the major conspiracy against Cæsar which begins here. * * *

In the second act, beginning at Act II., Scene 2, Cæsar is slowly drawn into the toils by fate overpowering will. The long anxiety of that slow-passing night, wherein the fates debated the future of all history, is protracted until one of the most impressive introdcctions in all literature is complete. We have hurried glimpses of parts of the city where agonizing dread of the day's issue is vividly imparted to us. In awful procession the events lead slowly on to the death. A climax is reached, the effect of which is harshly marred by the present awkward division between Acts II. and III. With the climax the act should close at the end of Act III., Scene 1. If Shakespeare ever intended to make of this portion a single play, on changing his plan the misplaced prominence of Cæsar's death needed "toning down;" and we might guess that the purpose of the long gradation of over two hundred lines which follows, was to bring us more agreeably to the proper dramatic level.

With the next scene new dramatic action begins, and the break is important. This long scene and the next short one have a marked unity when taken together. Except a few words from a servant, the only speakers in the first are Brutus and Antony and the leaders of the populace. The other scene has sometimes puzzled commentators. A new character, Cinna the poet, is introduced only to be torn to pieces by the infuriated citizens. Critics have said its purpose is simply to show the pitch of frenzy to which the citizens have been wrought by Antony's rhetoric, and so it forms a fitting climax. But there seems to be a deeper intent. The debate between the two great factions immediately arising after the murder of Cæsar, has been carried on before a grand jury of the entire Roman people. The actions at the capital and forum have spread their influence throughout the masses, and their reasonless murder of Cinna the poet, only because he bears the name of a minor conspirator, only for their hatred of a name, is Shakespeare's grim travesty of the blind, senseless deed of Brutus and his followers, hacking the body of Cæsar only for their hatred of a name. They destroy the symbol, but the reality, the principle at the base of all, still lives. Cæsar is killed, but no sooner is he dead than the state would raise another Cæsar, ay, and go a step farther and make him king. As well kill Cinna the poet to destroy Cinna the conspirator. These two scenes should comprise one entire act. The further main divisions of the play are easily and naturally made, even Heminge and Condell did not mistake them.

A striking sign of the widespread interest felt in Shakespearian subjects is the fact that so many managing editors of newspapers,—a wily and knowing lot, whose nose for news and eye to the market is trained

to the service,—are willing to give so much space as they do, rather frequently, to discussion of that "dead issue" which "yet liveth," Shakespeare.

For instance, these articles have come casually to notice. The Terre Haute *Express*, of August 29th, devotes a column or more to an account of the Donnelly Cipher, with some accompanying information about the Drama and the theatrical customs of Shakespeare's day, interesting details, and generally speaking, correct, though the assertion that all the plays "written prior to and including the year when Shakespeare began to write" are "so bad that not one of them will bear reading a second time" is a sweeping assertion, in need of qualification. Mr. Horace B. Jones, of Terre Haute, is the writer.

In the Chicago *Times*, of September 4th, Colonel E. A. Calkins fills over two columns with an entertaining statement of his inquiries into the relations of Shakespeare and Sir William Davenant.

The Chicago *Tribune*, of September 13th, publishes nearly four columns of reporterial interview with Mr. Ignatius Donnelly, in which Mr. Donnelly's political fame and his Shakespearian reputation are brought out together, after the impartial way of praise, peculiar to the newswriter. As to the book, somebody called the other day, Mr. Donnelly's Crypto-game, little new information is given, save this,—the reporter says

> he saw Mr. Donnelly draw from their hiding place four large bundles of cleanly-written manuscript, neatly bandaged off into chapters. The writing is bold and clear—excellent copy for the printer. There are few erasures. Mr. Donnelly at once began to describe the form of his book. It will consist, he said, of four parts. The first part is intended to prove that Shakespeare could not possibly have written the plays; the second part to prove that Bacon did write them; the third part will consist of parallel passages from the plays and the works of Bacon, which will indicate identity of thought, style, composition, feeling, knowledge, purpose, and of language to express the same ideas; the fourth part contains a full elucidation of the cipher which, he says, will prove conclusively that Bacon claimed in the plays their authorship.
>
> The first part consists of chapters under the following headings: "The Learning of the Plays," "Shakespeare's (Reputed) Literary Character," "Shakespeare's Real Character," and "Incompatibility of the Plays with Shakespeare's Character."

A later issue, September 25th, of the same paper, referring to this article, gives a brief account of Mr. Donnelly's theory and of circumstances connected with the issue by Hemminge and Condell of the First Folio, quotes the specimen proof of the Cipher, now well known, as Mr. Donnelly makes it out of 2 *Henry* IV. and concludes with some adverse comment.

The Philadelphia *Times*, of October 2nd, prints a slashing column under the head, *Shakespearian Guessing*. This article is evidently the outcome of a cursory glance at a number of this magazine, from which it gleans some points, and it comments with spicy disdain

upon what it calls "Amateurdom." The writer is a wholesale dealer in his style and thought, utterly impatient of the unmaterial, who takes up his subject with his superior hand and sweeps "Baconian cranks" and writers of "twaddle," such "as Goethe, Schlegel, and Coleridge," alike into the limbo where should abide the personages unimportant to a man about town.

MISCELLANY.

Restoration of the Hart Tablet.—On Tuesday last a meeting of the Church Restoration Committee was held at the Town-hall. There were present the Vicar (Rev. G. Arbuthnot) in the chair, Rev. F. Smith, Sir A. Hodgson, K. C. M. G., Messrs. C. E. Flower, E. Flower, G. W. Everard, J. Cox, W. C. Colbourne, J. Hill, J. J. Nason, R. M. Bird, T. Humphriss, and J. Morgan (local secretary).

The minutes of the meeting held on July 19th were read and signed. * * * * * * *

The question of the Hart tablet removal was brought before the meeting, and after a long discussion the following resolution was carried *nem con*:—"That the Restoration Committee regrets that the Hart memorial tablet should have been removed from the north wall of the church without their sanction or cognisance, and trust that it will be immediately restored." The tablet being in a very dilapidated condition in consequence of the action of the weather and the perishable nature of the stone, Sir Arthur Hodgson, generously offered to defray the cost of a brass tablet, to be placed immediately under the stone one, with an exact copy of the original inscription.

The offer was most cordially accepted.

Some minor business having been transacted, the meeting adjourned.

Yesterday, the above resolution was carried into effect, and the Hart tablet is now in its old place on the exterior of the north wall of the Parish Church.

The above notice, clipped from the *Stratford-on-Avon Herald*, for October 19th, shows how much easier it is to answer the Vicar of Stratford's question,—"Who is Mr. Sam Timmins?" as it was put in the letter quoted in the October Shakespeariana, than it has been to answer Mr. Timmin's prior question touching the removal of the Hart tablet,—"Who is the "some one" who give orders for such wreckage?" Thanks to Mr. Timmins' earnest and reasonable remonstrances, a wrong to all lovers of Shakespeare has been righted

before it was qnite too late, and thanks to the generous and public-spirited Mayor of Stratford, the damage already done, and irretrievably, is to be offset, so far as it may be, by the help of a brass facsimile of this tablet as it looked before its late unhappy adventures pending "restoration." The worn, time-stained stone and its spick and span modern companion will now hang together on the chancel wall, to tell future pilgrims to Shakespeare's shrine, with mute but striking eloquence, a curious bit of history. And these pilgrims hearing the story will join their thanks with those SHAKESPEARIANA gives now to the Shakespearian the Vicar did not know of, and the Mayor who is ever ready to come to the front and honorably make the best of a stiff circumstance.

Mr. F. Hawley, the librarian of *The Shakespeare Memorial*, writes SHAKESPEARIANA, under date of October 10th, that the recent agitation has been successful not only "in getting the Hart tablet restored to its original site on the wall of the church," but further "it has been decided by the Restoration Committee that no more unauthorized disturbances of Shakespearian relics are to be permitted." So far so good. Still, it might be well to make assurance doubly sure and take a bond of fate. As a writer signing himself "A Stratfordian" says in a recent letter to the London *Times*,—"while on the subject of the removal of memorial tablets, the committee might also inquire how many tombstones, railed vaults, etc., have disappeared from the chancel end of the graveyard during the present 'restoration.' Some clue to the number might be gained by an inspection of the great mass of broken slabs, palisades and curb-stones deposited like a heap of rubbish in the south corner of the churchyard. It is shocking to think that at the behest of the modern 'restorer' there should have been such wanton desecration of the memorials of the dead. With regard to the last restoration, which took place about half a century ago, the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings has reported that great damage was then done—'some of the most interesting old work being removed to make way for very inferior copies.' This shows the absolute necessity, as was pointed out by Mr. J. O. Halliwell Phillips in your columns a few days ago, of placing Stratford Church under National control. It is still a most interesting and magnificent structure, some portions dating back from 600 to 700 years, and as the burial place of Shakespeare —the mightiest genius the world has ever produced—the church forms a fitting object of national care."

SELECTED REPRINTS.

———:o:———

A SERIES OF SHAKESPEARE ILLUSTRATIONS

FORMING SUPPLEMENTS TO

SHAKESPEARIANA.

———:o:———

PART II.—PROLIGOMENA TO THE FOLIO OF 1623.

[*Concluded.*]

UPON THE LINES AND LIFE OF THE FAMOUS SCENICKE POET, MASTER WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

THOSE hands, which you so clapt, go now, and wring
You *Britaines* brave; for done are *Shakespeares* dayes:
His dayes are done, that made the dainty Playes,
Which made the Globe of heav'n and earth to ring.
Dry'de is that veine, dry'd is the *Thespian* Spring,
Turn'd all to teares, and *Phœbus* cloudes his rayes:
That corp's, that coffin now besticke those bayes,
Which crown'd him *Poet* first, then *Poets* King.
If *Tragedies* might any *Prologue* have,
All those he made, would scarce make one to this:
Where *Fame*, now that he gone is to the grave
(Deaths publique tyring-house) the *Nuncius* is.
For though his line of life went soon about,
The life yet of his lines shall never out,

HUGH HOLLAND.

TO THE MEMORIE

OF THE DECEASED AUTHOUR MAISTER

W. SHAKESPEARE.

Shake-speare, at length thy pious followes give
The world thy Workes: thy Workes, by which, out-live
Thy Tombe, thy name must: when that stone is rent,
And Time dissolves thy *Stratford* Moniment,
Here we alive shall view thee still. This Booke,
When Brasse and Marble fade, shall make thee looke
Fresh to all Ages: when Posterite
Shall loath what's new, thinke all is prodigie
That is not *Shake-speares;* ev'ry Line, each Verse
Here shall revive, redeeme thee from thy Herse.
Nor Fire, nor cankring Age, as *Naso* said,
Of his, thy wit-fraught Booke shall once invade.
Nor shall I e're beleeve, or thinke thee dead
(Though mist) untill our bankrout Stage be sped
(Impossible) with some new straine t'out-do
Passions of *Juliet* and her *Romeo:*
Or till I heare a Scene more nobly take,
Then when thy half-Sword parlying *Romans* spake.
Till these, till any of thy Volumes rest
Shall with more fire, more feeling be exprest,
Be sure, our *Shake-speare*, thou canst never dye,
But crown'd with Lawrell, live eternally.

L. DIGGES.

TO THE MEMORIE OF M. *W. SHAKE-SPEARE.*

WEE wondred (*Shake-speare*) that thou wentst so soone
From the Worlds-Stage, to the Graves-Tyring-roome.
Wee thought thee dead, but this thy printed worth,
Tels thy Spectators, that thou went'st but forth
To enter with applause. An Actors Art,
Can dye, and live, to acte a second part.
That's but an Exit of Mortalitie;
This, a Re-entrance to a Plaudite.

I. M.

SHAKESPEARIANA.

VOLUME I, - - BOUND, $5.00

But a limited number unsold. It is already a scarce book, and the price will soon be again raised.

VOLUME II, - - BOUND, $3.00

The stock of bound copies of Volume 2 is being rapidly exhausted; those desiring copies at original price should order promptly.

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.

1104 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

A NECESSITY TO EVERY LIBRARY.

THE LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.'S

PERIODICALS.

For deep research and erudition, for profundity of scholarship and wealth of intellect, they are unrivalled by any other serial publications of either Europe or America.

Nineteenth Century.

No other journal numbers among its contributors so many brilliant thinkers and profound scholars. The most important changes in the thought of the times are submitted to searching criticism and review

Contemporary Review.

The monthly contributions, by eminent writers, describing the contemporary life and thought of the leading nations of the world, give it an unique position among other Journals, presenting an epitome of all that best deserves attention in the world of thought and action.

Fortnightly Review.

The greatest exponent of radicalism in England. Its Editors and Contributors have ever been noted as leaders of progress, and have formed a school of advanced thinkers, which may justly be cited as the most powerful factor of reform in the British Empire and elsewhere.

Each, $4.50. Any Two, $8.50. All Three, $12.00.

British Quarterly.

While discussing all branches of modern thought, is particularly devoted to the consideration of the more recent theories in Theology and Philosophy. Its articles are characterized by a keenly critical spirit, and for fulness of treatment and justness of criticism it stands alone, in its special field, among the periodicals of the world.

Edinburgh Review.

Numbers among its contributors the greatest names that have moulded English thought for the past eighty years. While its policy admits the discussion of all questions, its conservatism is tempered with a liberalism that marks it as the INDEPENDENT REVIEW of the world.

Quarterly Review.

Its reviews cover all the leading issues of the day, and embrace the latest discoveries in Science, in History, and in Archæology. Much space is devoted to ecclesiastical history and matters connected with the Church, thus making the Review invaluable to the clerical student, as well as of great interest to the general reader.

Westminster Review.

Is notable for the latitude of its theological views, many of the most advanced of modern theories in theology having received in its pages their first authoritative support. A distinctive feature of this Review is its "INDEPENDENT SECTION," containing articles advocating views at variance with those of its editors.

Blackwood's Magazine.

Is the leading and most popular magazine of Great Britain. The tone of its articles, be they fiction, incidents of travel, critical or political essays, is unexceptionable, rendering it most desirable for the Home Circle.

Each, $3.00. Any Two, $5.50. Any Three, $8.00. Any Four, $10.50. All Five, $13.00.

All of above are printed line for line—page for page—with English Editions, but in handier form.

Shakespeariana.

While aiming to furnish a recognized medium for the interchange of views among Shakespearian scholars, and to afford the student the fullest information relative to Shakespeare's art, life and writings, SHAKESPEARIANA is specially designed to extend the influence of Shakespeare as a popular educator, and to stimulate the study of his works in our colleges and institutions of learning.

$1.50 Per Year.

☞Full Index Circulars furnished upon application.☜

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.,

1104 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

THE FERREE PRESS.